

HELLENISTIC CULT STATUES OF THE OLYMPIAN

GODS IN GREECE AND ASIA MINOR

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**BY
PETER JOHN HIGGS**

APRIL 1994

VOL. I

Abstract

Hellenistic cult statues of the Olympian gods in Greece and Asia Minor, by Peter J. Higgs, of S.A.C.O.S., Liverpool University.

This thesis analyses Hellenistic cult images of the Olympian gods in Greece and Asia Minor. It is divided into two volumes; the first is an analysis of the cult images themselves, the second a catalogue of surviving sculptures with illustrations.

The main part of the text begins with an introduction, which outlines the aims of the thesis and also a short survey of scholarship in the study. The introduction continues with a section placing the Olympian gods in their Hellenistic context, and also an analysis of the function and appearance of cult images in general. The sources used in this thesis are also evaluated.

The main text is divided up into nine chapters, Zeus and Hera, Poseidon and Amphitrite, Demeter and Kore, Asklepios and Hygieia, Dionysos, Apollo and Artemis, Aphrodite and Ares, Athena, and Hermes. These chapters contain an analysis of the surviving evidence for Hellenistic cult statues, with an emphasis on style, types, chronology and historical context. The important elements of these chapters are the identification of particular statues as specific deities, and the evidence (or lack of it) for their having served as cult images. One major section analyses the relationship between the Melos group and other sculptures and groups on coins. An attempt is also made to remove the classicising label from many of the sculptures discussed, notably for the Lykosoura group, the Poseidon from Melos and the Dionysos from Aegira. Another important element is the attempt to demonstrate that the Klaros group, the Trojan Zeus and the Kyzikos Kore are Hellenistic rather than Roman creations.

The conclusion gathers this information in sections dealing with technique and materials, style, types, the sculptors and their patrons. Table 1 brings these cult images together in a chronological order showing possible patterns in patronage or technique, regional variations, and displays the sources available which can be used to reconstruct the appearance or history of a specific statue or group.

Abbreviations and a bibliography are located at the end of volume one.

Volume two, the catalogue, provides descriptive details of the surviving sculptures, as well as provenance, museum registration and catalogue numbers, dimensions, materials and a bibliography for each sculpture or group. Many of the surviving pieces are illustrated by photographs and some with line drawings.

Acknowledgements

A study of this nature has involved over such a long period of time has involved my coming into contact with many people who have helped and encouraged me along the way. These are too many to name individually here, but I would like to take this opportunity to officially thank the following. I would like to thank all the staff and students of the School of Archaeology, Classics and Oriental Studies at Liverpool University for all their support and friendship. Much of this encouragement has come from my supervisor Chris Mee, who has nurtured my interest in Greek sculpture and read and made invaluable comments on the content during the development of my thesis. I also owe much to the staff of the Field Archaeology Unit at Liverpool for providing me with fieldwork experience which assisted me in procuring places on excavations in Greece, at both Sparta and Torone. I wish also to acknowledge the other members of these excavation teams, many of whom became good friends and further stimulated my passion for archaeology.

Further thanks must go to the staff of the British School at Athens for their hospitality and many of the students there for providing me with the opportunity for discussion, and also for their companionship in travel. Special thanks must go to Jamie Morton, for accompanying me to many secluded sites on the Greek mainland and to Gürkan Yildirim for being my guide and special friend in Turkey. I would also like to thank Nigel Spencer for all of being a constant source of inspiration and motivating me in my research.

During the final stages of my thesis, many people have assisted me, particularly all the staff of the Greek and Roman department of the British Museum. I am particularly

indebted to Lucilla Burn and Paul Roberts who have spent much time proof-reading my text and any remaining mistakes are my own. Special thanks must also go to Sue Bird, for assisting me in my attempts to reconstruct the sculptures, and to Susan Walker, Ian Jenkins and Dyfri Williams for useful advice and support. For helping me with difficult foreign language texts, I owe great thanks to Sarah Milligan in Liverpool and Natasha Psarolagaki for teaching me modern Greek, an invaluable contribution to my research.

Photographic help was provided by Philip Nicholls and Jonathan Hamilton, who gave me sensible advice whilst I was printing the photographs. Thanks must also go to John Swogger for the line drawings in the illustrations.

Most of all, I would like to thank my family and close friends, without whose encouragement I would not have completed my research. Special thanks must go to Richard Wright for encouraging and inspiring me, and for always being there. Finally for having the patience, love and understanding to see me through the most difficult stage of my thesis, I would like to thank Maria Gonet, who assisted me with the organisation and final preparations of the text and photographs.

Table of Contents

Volume One - Main Text

Introduction	Page 1
Aims	Page 1
The role and function of the Olympians during the Hellenistic period	Page 8
Sources of evidence	Page 13
The function and appearance of cult images	Page 16
Chapter One Zeus and Hera	Page 21
Chapter Two Poseidon and Amphitrite	Page 65
Chapter Three Demeter and Kore	Page 96
Chapter Four Asklepios and Hygieia	Page 143
Chapter Five Dionysos	Page 188
Chapter Six Apollo and Artemis	Page 217
Chapter Seven Aphrodite and Ares	Page 272
Chapter Eight Athena	Page 300
Chapter Nine Hermes	Page 323
Table 1	Page 324
Conclusion	Page 328
Section A - The cult images	Page 330
Scale and display	Page 331
Technique, material and decoration	Page 335
Types	Page 342
Style	Page 344

Section B - The sculptors and their patrons	Page 352
The sculptors	Page 352
Financing of cult statues in the Hellenistic period	Page 355
Abbreviations	Page 363
Bibliography	Page 365

Volume Two - Appendix One and Figures

Catalogue	Page 1
Section A - Fragments of definite or possible cult images from temple or sanctuary sites	Page 4
Section B - Original Hellenistic fragments possibly from cult images	Page 54
Section C - Copies of possible cult statues	Page 85

Introduction

Aims

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate that in the Hellenistic period the Olympian gods were as popular in sculpture as they had been in previous periods, and to use the surviving cult images of the gods to illustrate this point. The study requires an analysis of style and iconography, of the sculptors who carved these cult statues, the techniques they used and their patrons. Chronology is an important consideration, and, where possible, attempts will be made to date the sculptures, but broad dates must generally be preferred. The intention is to examine both the numerous extant pieces and those recorded in literary texts and on coins, and to place them in their archaeological, historical and socio-religious context. Most of the cult images are inadequately studied and little known, but merit examination because they form an important core of original Hellenistic material. It is not the intention to form a corpus or a catalogue of every fragment of Hellenistic cult images, as it is often impossible to determine whether a sculpture served a ritual or some other function. Yet those that are known definitely to have served as temple statues are analysed alongside those which may have operated as such.

In general, cult images have only been studied either individually or when a famous sculptor can be associated with a known statue. Early Greek cult images have been the focus of much attention over the last decade or so, Romano and Papadopoulos having written important accounts of this category of sculpture.¹ These provide essential and

¹ Romano, 1988 and Papadopoulos, 1980.

interesting information about so-called *xoana* and *sphyrelata* which were the precursors of later, and usually, larger cult statues. Classical cult images have never been examined as a whole, as few original pieces survive, but some famous, though lost, cult statues have been the subject of intensive analysis, for example the Zeus and Athena by Phidias, the Nemesis by Agorakritos, fragments of which do survive, and several fourth-century examples. Of course, most of these are attributed to famous sculptors and either identified on coins, or as marble reproductions, or known from the literary record. Roman cult statues have also attracted recent attention, with thorough investigations by Vermeule and Martin.² Hellenistic cult statues have rarely been analysed as a group of material.

Past studies of Hellenistic sculpture have concentrated on themes such as portraiture, abstract personifications, the development of genre themes and realism. There has also been much analysis of the so-called Baroque and Rococo styles and, admittedly, sculptures of the Olympians have been used to illustrate these styles, but the material used usually consists of relief sculpture, with the Great Altar at Pergamon being the most obvious example. Original free-standing images of the gods are less well known and, apart from the Asklepios and Poseidon from Melos or the Lykosoura cult group, many of the statues examined here are rarely illustrated in text books. Furthermore, many of the statues of deities depicted in such books are copies, usually of Aphrodite, Apollo or Dionysos, three of the most frequently portrayed deities in the arts of the period. This is probably due to the fact that few Hellenistic originals are associated with famous sculptors; Hellenistic sculptors in general are less well documented than their Classical counterparts. The recent studies of Hellenistic sculpture by Ridgway and Smith are welcome additions to the few

² Vermeule, 1987, and Martin, 1987.

books on the subject, and the latter including sections on gods and goddesses which illustrate several important pieces.³

Hellenistic cult statues have only once before been the subject of an intensive analysis, that of Laubscher's thesis of 1960.⁴ More detailed studies have concentrated on particular deities or types, such as Fleischer's analysis of the Artemis of Ephesos and later Anatolian style cult statues of the goddess.⁵ Pochmarski has examined the iconography of Dionysos in depth, but concentrated on Archaic and Classical statues and Roman groups.⁶ The recent articles concerning individual deities in the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* are more ambitious studies, involving a great deal of illustrative material, but even they have not always considered the numerous Hellenistic examples examined here. The entries on Kore/Persephone, Poseidon and Zeus still await publication.

Individual articles on specific Hellenistic cult statues do appear intermittently. The Asklepios from Melos has been analysed in depth by both Ashmole and Borbein, Brinkerhoff has studied Hellenistic statues of Aphrodite in depth, and Andreae has attempted to down-date the sculptor Phrymachos in a lengthy discussion, based upon the cult image of Asklepios at Pergamon.⁷ Schafer published a detailed and informative article on the Poseidon from Melos, but omitted the important Amfitrite from the cult group.⁸ Other Hellenistic cult statues are less well known. The main reason why the head of Dionysos from Athens is included here is because of the article in which Bruskari

³ Ridgway, 1990 and Smith, 1991.

⁴ I have been unable to consult this thesis and little mention is made of it in the text.

⁵ Fleischer, 1973.

⁶ Pochmarski, 1974 and 1990.

⁷ Ashmole, 1951 (2); Borbein, 1988; Brinkerhoff, 1978; Andreae, 1990.

⁸ Schafer, 1968.

highlights this otherwise unknown head and the same is true of the Boston Demeter, only published by Caskey.⁹ One of the most recent in-depth studies of a Hellenistic cult image was Carter's analysis of the Athena Polias at Priene, reconstructed from the fragments in the British Museum.¹⁰ Some of the most relevant articles published during recent years are those of Themelis on Damophon and the various surviving sculptures attributed to him.¹¹ Other important cult groups such as the Kallipolis and Klaros groups, and the recently found cult statues in the sanctuaries at Dion, still await detailed publication. All the above, and other examples, have done much to bring several of the individual cult images to our attention; but the objective of the present thesis is to bring as many of these sculptures as possible together to demonstrate how the iconography of the Olympian deities developed in the Hellenistic period, and to explore the relationships, both stylistic and historical, between the various cult images.

Such a study naturally involves a detailed analysis of styles, a subject that has caused much controversy over the years. One such style centres on the so-called classicising stream of sculptors, who have been assigned a second-century date. Many Greek sculpture specialists, including Becatti, Stewart and Pollitt, have given this style much attention, but only recently has the label "classicising" been questioned and doubted as a label for certain sculptures; because many of the Hellenistic cult images have been labelled as such in the past, considerable attention is required here to assess the existence of such a classicising trend. In fact, the present study began as an analysis of second century classicism and grew into the broader issue of cult images of the Olympian gods.

⁹ Bruskari, 1988; Caskey, 1916 and 1937.

¹⁰ Carter, 1983.

¹¹ Themelis, 1993, I & II.

The bulk of the text deals with the cult images themselves. For convenience's sake, the period under scrutiny is 325 - 100 B.C.: the lower date is an artificial barrier, but in the first century B.C. the dedication of cult images of Olympian deities drastically decreases until the Romans really take a hold in the regions concerned. Limiting the period covered in this thesis may lead to the omission of several important cult images of the late Hellenistic period, the most obvious being the Aphrodite at Aphrodisias, but most of the cult images for which some evidence survives will be included.

Each god deserves individual attention, but some groups of deities are best discussed together, namely Zeus and Hera, Demeter and Kore and Apollo and Artemis. Not all the gods studied are strictly members of the Olympian pantheon, but Amphitrite, Leto, Hygieia and others, cannot be ignored as they were often shown with their respective husbands or families. Asklepios is considered here an Olympian god because of his popularity during the period and as there is little, or no, evidence for Olympians such as Hestia, Ares, Hephaistos and Hermes, the inclusion of Asklepios seems justified. One obvious omission is Herakles, who, although he did gain Olympian stature in terms of the amount of temples and cult images dedicated to him, was still only a demi-god.

Furthermore, his iconography during the period perhaps deserves a study of its own. The analysis is restricted to the Olympian gods because of the amount of material involved. The inclusion of cult statues of deities such as Isis, Sarapis seems alien to this study and would require a much broader geographical region than the one under examination here.

The thesis involves only those cult images dedicated in Greece and Asia Minor, with the exception of the Apollo at Daphne near Antioch, included as perhaps the major cult image

of the god from the period. Egypt has also been omitted because of the lack of surviving cult statues or, indeed, temples, dedicated to Olympian gods. There is little evidence from northern Greece and the islands of the northern Aegean, central Greece and the southern, central and eastern regions of Asia Minor. In fact most of the surviving pieces from Asia Minor come from sites on the west coast. The Peloponnese has only yielded evidence for Arkadia, Achaia and the Argolid. The Greek islands as a whole have produced few, but important cult images, but Rhodes, Kos and Delos have yielded few identifiable cult statues, which is surprising considering their wealth and amount of other sculpture dedicated here in the Hellenistic period. Attika, and particularly Athens, is also poorly represented. Much of the literary evidence, particularly that of Pausanias, mentions cult images in many of these regions, but it is not always possible to determine whether they are Hellenistic in date. Future excavations will hopefully fill the gaps in these regions, as they are already doing in sanctuaries in northern Greece, notably at Dion, and further examination of fragments of sculpture in museum storerooms, may also add new cult images.

The architectural development of sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period is also noted throughout the text. The construction of new temples, altars and other buildings in shrines indicates the continued prominence of the cults of the Olympian gods, and therefore is mentioned even when no evidence for the cult images survives.

The conclusion brings much of this information together and is divided into two sections. The first discusses the cult images themselves, their techniques, materials, styles and types; the second involves the sculptors and their patrons.

The catalogue is also an important element in this study as it provides descriptive details that can be used as the basis for many of the stylistic parallels in the main text. It is separated because it provides information that would appear intrusive if placed in the main text. Details such as inventory numbers, dimensions and individual bibliographies for each image or group can be found here. The catalogue numbers are, however, referred to throughout the text.

The introduction can be divided into two sections. In the first section, the broader issue will be addressed, namely the importance of the Olympian gods during the Hellenistic period; and scholarly criticisms of the significance of their cults will briefly be reviewed. The second section will deal with the function and role of the cult image in ancient Greek religious practices, and will also discuss the sources used in this study. There is not room here to provide extensive historical details of the history of the period, which is politically complex, but relevant details are provided where appropriate. To begin with, the Olympian gods need to be analysed in terms of their role in Hellenistic society. The views of both ancient authors and modern scholars have so far reflected a rather negative attitude towards this family of gods during the period, and this needs to be examined before the cult images can be placed in context.

The role and function of the Olympians in the Hellenistic period

The Olympian pantheon of Homeric gods has been associated with the most affluent and triumphant period of Greek history, that is the fifth century B.C. The reputation of these gods, however, is considered by many historians to have been reduced considerably in the Hellenistic period, and most scholarly opinion assumes that the Olympians had had their day and that surrender to the Oriental deities was inevitable. Yonah takes a more moderate view, and claims that the Olympian religion took on a more Oriental cast, while the cults of the Olympians carried on unchanged throughout the period, with new temples built in their honour.¹² Admittedly certain gods, such as Demeter and Dionysos, particularly those who had a chthonic aspect and for whom mystery rites were common, found renewed popularity in the period; yet temples were constructed for most of the Olympians throughout all regions of the Hellenistic world, with only a few, such as Hephaistos and Ares, seeming to become less popular.

One factor seen as a major blow to the Olympian religion is the decline of the city state. Before Alexander's death, the social, political and religious activities of a citizen were structured around his membership of his polis, tribe, deme and family, and each of these groups had a specific location for their worship. In Athens, for instance, the site for the rituals and festivities of the polis was the Acropolis and at the other end of the hierarchy, the ordinary man had his own shrine in his home, that is the hearth of Hestia. It was in these civic cults that moral teaching was to be found, in the myths largely created by Homer and centred on the Olympian family. Earlier this century, most scholars were of

¹² Yonah, 1978,29.

the opinion that when the polis was weakened as a governing force, the Olympians were no longer required and man could select his own choice of deities. Typical of the historians' view is that of Ferguson, who claims that the Olympians were doomed to die with the city state.¹³ However, as Gordon notes, it has been usual to exaggerate the political and social changes which took place after Alexander's death.¹⁴ Festivals of Olympian deities continued into the Hellenistic period and the wealthy classes still financed priesthoods and made expensive donations to sanctuaries and dedications to the gods. Their motive, of course, may have had as much to do with personal prestige as devotion to their gods, but we cannot determine the attitude of the people towards their gods from any other source than the donations they presented or dedications they made. Furthermore, there is no obvious shift in favour of participating in cults of new deities rather than Olympian gods, and, in any case, Classical religion had not solely recognised Olympian cults. Therefore, we should not view the Hellenistic period as one where eastern deities began to dominate cult practice, but rather as a time when religion became more diverse and people had more choice of deities to worship.

The cults of Egyptian deities, such as Isis and Sarapis, and of other non-Olympian gods like Kybele and Attis, grew in significance in the Hellenistic period. In sculpture, personifications, such as Tyche, became extremely important now, particularly when new cities were founded; the most obvious example was Tyche of Antioch. Yet none of these new cults over-shadowed those of the Olympian gods, whose existing sanctuaries were embellished and to whom offerings were still made. Furthermore, the new cities of the

¹³ Ferguson, 1911, 226.

¹⁴ Gordon, 1972,53.

eastern Aegean, Asia Minor and beyond all had their own temples of Zeus, Apollo, Athena and Aphrodite, attested either archaeologically or in the literary record. The island of Delos provides a fine example of the resulting diversification of cults, where shrines of both Olympian gods and Oriental deities flourished side by side.

Mystery religions were a significant attraction to the Hellenistic worshipper, with cults, such as that of the "Great Gods" on Samothrake, prospering along with cults of the Eleusinian deities and Dionysos. Dionysos and Demeter were certainly two of the most popular deities during the Hellenistic period, a factor evident in the amount of surviving sanctuaries and cult images of the goddess and her daughter Kore. Dionysos is also widely viewed as the god of the Hellenistic period, particularly as the protector of several Hellenistic dynasties; he is also seen as the god of expansion into the Hellenised east. Gordon explains how the inhabitants of the new cities in this period saw Greek gods as an essential part of Hellenic culture, and he claims in such cities the Olympians took on new roles.¹⁵ Yet he adds that the Olympians' most important function, that of regulating the conditions and ideals of social life, as controlled by the polis, was now taken over by human agency, that is, by the kings who proclaimed themselves gods.¹⁶ There is no time here to discuss ruler cults in detail, though examples will be cited where relevant throughout the text. It is, however, important to assess the relationship between monarchies and the gods.

¹⁵ Gordon, 1972,55.

¹⁶ Gordon, 1972,54.

Hellenistic dynasties claimed protection and also a genealogical connection with Olympian or other deities. The Antigonids, for example, were under the care of Herakles, the Seleukids under Apollo, and the Attalids under Dionysos. In Egypt the Ptolemies used most of the male Olympians as their divine protectors, including Dionysos, Zeus, Apollo, Helios, Eros, Hermes and Poseidon, but, of these, Dionysos was the most significant. The queens also assimilated themselves to female members of the Olympian family, with Arsinoe II and Berenike both identifying themselves with Aphrodite. Walbank claimed that ruler cult became more important to the occupants of the cities because of the unstable political conditions, and that the people, perhaps less confident in the traditional gods, looked to the ruler for immediate protection.¹⁷ Again, the archaeological record can neither substantiate nor disprove such a theory.

Rulers certainly set up their cults in the temples of the gods; Attalos III, for example, established his cult in the Temple of Asklepios at Elaea and had sacrifices instituted on the altars of the Olympians Zeus Soter, Zeus Boulaios and Hestia Boulaia. At Teos, Antiochos III was awarded similar honours by the people of the region and his cult was inaugurated in the temple of Dionysos. The sharing of temples between the resident god and the ruler was a common phenomenon, but this practice of semi-deification has been the object of criticism by those scholars who view this practice as indicating a decline in religious standards. Ferguson rather rashly claims that almost anybody could obtain an entrance ticket to Mount Olympus - departed kings, rulers and other benefactors.¹⁸ It could be said that this almost made a mockery of the immortals, but cults of the

¹⁷ Walbank, 1984,87.

¹⁸ Ferguson, 1911,110.

Olympians alone still flourished beside ruler cults; in fact, the survival of each was probably dependent on the other. Because of such ruler cults, some Hellenistic cult statues have been considered either to combine a portrait of a king with the image of a god, or to be cult statues of the monarchs themselves. Such complications arise in two of the cult statues of Zeus, those from Sardis and Pergamon, which will be dealt with below. Identifications of cult images of goddesses have also been problematic, as some have been likened to certain Ptolemaic portraits of queens. It will, therefore, be interesting to determine how ruling dynasties may have manipulated cults of the gods and also whether they promoted cults and financed temples and cult images: in order to demonstrate this, the cult images need to be analysed.

Sources of evidence

The sources used in this study are varied and sometimes need to be combined to reconstruct particular cult images. Obviously the primary evidence is that of the surviving sculptures, excavated in temple or sanctuary sites. Many of these have been published, but usually in rather dated excavation reports. Other evidence is provided by original fragments of sculpture which have been identified as representations of the Olympian deities. A further source of evidence is to be formed by copies, which are treated in the text as either important stylistic parallels or major reproductions in their own right. Representations of cult images that can be positively identified on reliefs are rare, but there are some valuable examples.

Terracotta copies of cult images tend to be more a feature of the Archaic and Classical periods than of the Hellenistic period. Alroth has made an interesting study of such votives and concluded that cult images may have only loosely inspired the appearance of terracottas, but that they can yield some useful information.¹⁹ This is particularly true for the Archaic period when some *xoana* are imitated in terracotta. For the Hellenistic period, only Elateia and Lykosoura have yielded a variety of terracotta votives that have been studied in any detail, and none of them seem to have copied the cult images at those sanctuaries. This lack of terracotta copies of Hellenistic cult images is perhaps not surprising, since even some of the most famous cult images of the Classical world, such as the Zeus at Olympia or the Asklepios at Epidauros, did not generate copies in this material.

¹⁹ Alroth, 1989, 106.

If terracottas are unhelpful, coins are an extremely important source of evidence for Hellenistic cult images. The evidence gleaned from these is invaluable, despite their small size and the fact that die cutters could only sketchily reproduce a statue on the coins. The disadvantage is that most coins showing cult statues were minted much later in date than the statue's manufacture and dedication. A further problem is that the coins vary in details. Coins need to be treated with caution as it is difficult to recognise specific cult images from generic types or other statues in a city. The most faithful must be those which show the statue within its temple setting.

Inscriptions also provide a certain amount of relevant information about cult images. The temple inventories from Delos are particularly illuminating on details of technique, the materials in which cult images were made and any repairs required at a later date. Other inscriptions tell us the names of the sculptors, such as Damophon and Attalos, of the cult images, or at least of the dedicator of the temple. Some inscriptions provide useful facts about others works by sculptors, Telesinos for example. Whether it was common practice to inscribe the name of the sculptor on the base of the cult image or group is uncertain; only a few of the examples studied here have such inscriptions.

Literary evidence is perhaps more revealing about the appearance of cult images, and was an important factor governing the selection of Hellenistic examples presented here. The most helpful ancient writer is Pausanias, whose thorough descriptions of many sanctuaries, both in cities and rural sites, have provided the only evidence for several of the preserved cult images. Only a few of those Hellenistic cult images that Pausanias saw have survived. These are the Lykosoura group, the Apollo at Messene and the Athena at

Elateia; he also refers to the Athena Polias at Priene.²⁰ Pliny also mentions a few Hellenistic cult images, such as the Asklepios by Phyromachos and the Zeus at Nikomedea and provides interesting information about the Polykles family of sculptors. A few late sources provide clues as to the appearance of the Apollo at Daphne and its attribution to Bryaxis. Used in conjunction with surviving sculptures and coins, these literary records can be of great value.

The initial choice of the sculptures used to illustrate Hellenistic cult images was largely determined by their having been published in textbooks, museum catalogues, excavation reports or in articles. Subsequently, many of the pieces were studied in their museum setting, where it was not always possible to examine the sculpture in close detail. Extensive travel around sites and museums in Greece and Turkey added a few extra pieces, but the lack of detailed find spots or excavation records renders an exact identification of a sculpture's function difficult in many cases. Therefore, there are probably many omissions from the study, which is not intended to be a thorough catalogue of every Hellenistic cult statue fragment, but rather an analysis of known or possible temple statues. It was impossible to study certain pieces at first hand, including the Kallipolis cult group, which remains unpublished, and the fragment of the Athena from Elateia, which is also hidden from public view.

²⁰ On the Athena at Priene, Pausanias, 7.5.3.

The function and appearance of cult images

What is a cult image ? This question needs to be addressed before any analysis of Hellenistic examples can commence. The obvious answer is that it is a material representation of a deity within a temple or shrine. This is perhaps rather over-simplified and excludes those cult statues that stood outside a building. There are perhaps fewer examples of these during the Classical and Hellenistic periods, but they were more common during the Archaic period; the masks of Dionysos erected on pillars or hung in trees are the obvious examples. Yet without epigraphic or literary evidence it would be impossible to determine the exact function of an idol found outside a temple setting. Therefore, it should be remembered that many of the surviving Hellenistic sculptures not included here as cult images, may in fact have functioned as such. We should, in fact, be asking the question as to what came first, the temple or the cult image; the answer is probably the latter, as is demonstrated by the images of Dionysos mentioned above. Temples were erected to house both the cult statue and other precious dedications. Whether temples were first conceived to shelter the cult images or the numerous and precious votive offerings, which became more abundant during the Archaic period and later, is difficult to determine. Temples were perhaps locked for much of the time, probably to protect the offerings as much as the image itself.

Cult statues were also the focal point for prayer and rituals. They were the means of communication between gods and men, men's prayers being conveyed to a deity through his or her image. Addressing prayers directly to an image of a god is commonly found in epic poetry and plays. In Euripides' *Andromache*, Neoptolemos prays to the statue of

Apollo at Delphi in order to apologise to the god.²¹ Cult images were not intended to be an actual manifestation of the deity, but rather a likeness, which the god could inhabit if he or she wished. They existed because the worshipper needed to see his gods, and required that they took human form, and devotees possibly believed that they would come close to the god by approaching his image. Whether it was thought that the gods actually inhabited the image at certain times, particularly festivals, and times of sacrifice, is unclear. Playwrights indicated that the gods did sometimes occupy their images, as in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* when Orestes touches the image of Athena and the goddess comes to her statue.²² If this were the case, it may have been thought that the more beautiful the image, the more likely a deity was to inhabit it.

That the cult images were important focal points for holy rituals and sacrifices is shown by their position in the temple. They usually faced the altar in front of the temple and we should perhaps imagine that the doors were opened when sacrifices were made to the deity in order for the god to see what was being offered. Yet whether individual worshippers could enter the temple to make their offerings on regular occasions is difficult to determine. Restrictions were placed on entry to temples and even, by the second century A.D. when Pausanias travelled around Greece, many such limitations were still in effect preventing free access to cult images. The terms of these restrictions varied greatly, depending on the deity and the specific cult, the sex of the individual worshipper and his or her social status or ethnic origin. Chthonic cults appear to have had the largest number of regulations concerning access to the cult image. In general, there seems to have been

²¹ Euripides, *Andromache*, lines 1110-1120.

²² Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, lines 235-244.

no general canon of regulations covering admission to temples, and some were more accessible than others. For much of the year, many cult images may well have been shut away, with the priests or priestesses tending and cleaning them. At festival times, these cult images may have been more accessible to the devotees of the cult, since worshippers needed their gods to take on a tangible form, to touch, perhaps move, dress and bathe their images.

Early cult statues often took the form of unshaped stones or simple wooden idols bearing little resemblance to human form. Such *xoana* were not replaced by anthropomorphic images in terms of ritual importance, as there are instances of ancient idols standing alongside later Classical cult statues as, for example, in the Argive Heraion. Gardner observes that when both the ancient *xoanon* and the later image stood together, the first represented the actual subject of the rites, the other the visible presence of the deity.²³ Burkert holds that the only true cult images were the wooden *xoana*, and that later cult statues were really lavish votive offerings.²⁴ Where an ancient image survived, it is true that this was the main focus of the rituals, as was the case with the ancient figure of Athena Polias in Athens, but if such an image did not survive, then the Classical or Hellenistic figures must have replaced it in terms of its ritual function. Where they did survive, it was these ancient images that tended to be the most prominent in terms of ritual practices, particularly during festivals. Images made of wood or those that were small in size were more portable than the colossal marble, or delicate chryselephantine and acrolithic cult statues of the Classical and later periods. Because of this, it was probably

²³ Gardner, 1923, 18.

²⁴ Burkert, 1985,90.

these ancient images that were transported in festivals rather than larger, later cult statues.²⁵ So perhaps Classical and Hellenistic, large-scale cult statues were not taken out of their temples and carried in procession like their Archaic counterparts.

Another interesting element is that additions could have been made to cult images at a later date, whether the statues were ancient *xoana*, Classical or Hellenistic in origin. At a simple level, some were adorned with new garments at festival times but permanent additions may have come in the form of gilding, extra metal appendages, or even new attributes. Such alterations would have been easier to apply on wooden, acrolithic or chryselephantine cult images but not impossible on marble ones. This may explain the variations in the representations of cult images on coins and the marble copies. Thus the cult images had the potential to be ever changing in their appearance. It is, of course, difficult to identify any such alterations on the surviving Hellenistic cult statues, but we cannot rule out the possibility that some were modified over the years.

What the literary or archaeological record does not tell us is the way in which these cult statues were viewed by their worshippers. That they were an important part of religious practices is obvious through the attention they receive. Yet there are few records of reactions towards cult statues, apart from enthusiastic responses to the most famous examples, such as Phidias's Zeus at Olympia, the beauty of which was claimed by Quintilian to add something great to religion.²⁶ Pausanias, while he not infrequently records his admiration for the spectacular engineering feats of the sculptors of Hellenistic

²⁵ See Bald-Romano, 1988, 128, on the possibilities of moving cult images.

²⁶ See Stewart, 1990, 259-61, for the ancient sources appraising for the Zeus.

examples, rarely remarks on the effect of the statue as a religious idol. It is fortunate that many of the surviving sculptures can still evoke awe in the present-day visitor's mind, and so, even today, we can go some way in reconstructing the original effect of these cult images.

The surviving Hellenistic cult images of the Olympian deities have rarely generated such enthusiastic responses from later writers, the exception being the Apollo from Daphne to be discussed below. To begin with, the cult statues of Zeus and Hera will be discussed in chronological order.

The archaeological record has left several original cult statue fragments of Zeus and Hera from their many temples constructed during the Hellenistic period. Both the old city states and rural towns of mainland Greece witnessed the embellishment of the sanctuaries of Zeus and new temples were constructed in his honour. In western Asia Minor the new Hellenistic dynasts built many shrines and temples to Zeus and Hera also, but it was the layout of the sanctuary that gained most attention rather than the actual temple. The great Altar at Pergamon, where no actual temple to Zeus was built, and the shrines at Priene, Magnesia on the Maeander and the Hera sanctuary at Pergamon illustrate this architectural phenomenon suitably. In terms of surviving cult images from the remaining temples, however, we are not so fortunate, as many of the largest or most prominent structures preserve no trace of the cult images. The fact that such cult images were famous, however, has meant that certain of these statues were reproduced on the city's coins and some may be recognised in reduced copies or variations. The literary record is also helpful in reconstructing the cult images of Zeus especially, but, where more than one image of the god stood in a particular city, it is difficult to isolate cult images from votive statues. Where original fragments of sculpture survive, it is often the case that no temple can be identified at the site where such a cult image could have been contained. In these cases, the fragments of sculpture have been labelled as possible cult images. Furthermore, certain pieces help us to restore the picture when no other evidence survives. This is the case for Hera where two images, neither of which have a secure provenance, are utilised in order to demonstrate possible representations of her temple statues. Before the Hellenistic examples are examined, a brief survey of the late Classical cult images seems

appropriate. The importance there lies in the transition from the mid fourth century to the early Hellenistic period when the great masters and their schools were active.

The Late Classical Forerunners

Two of the most prolific and influential of fourth century sculptors, Skopas and Praxiteles, did not appear to have created a type for Zeus, or at least the literary record does not inform us that these sculptors created statues of the god. Praxiteles, however, was responsible for two cult images of Hera that have been recorded, one at Mantinea and the other at Plataea.¹ Neither of these survive, nor can they be identified in later copies or on coins; in fact copies of late Classical statues of either deity are rare. One possible copy of an earlier fourth century statue of Zeus is the Ince Blundell Zeus, that Ashmole proposed reproduced a statue possibly by Kephisodotos the father of Praxiteles and its type has also been compared to the Cyrene Zeus.² Original fragments representing the two deities are even rarer. The head of Zeus now in Boston, but originally from Mylasa, is a rare late Classical sculpture of the god and for Hera there is a headless statue from her sanctuary on Samos, though its identification as the goddess is tenuous.³ The Mylasa Zeus has been considered as a contemporary copy of the cult image of Zeus at Labraunda for a shrine in Karia, but Pollitt claimed that the head is permeated with the Phidian spirit and must have been inspired by the Olympia cult statue. This example exposes the major problem concerning cult images of Zeus, that they were ultimately derived from the

¹ The Mantinea Hera was grouped with Athena and Hebe and was recorded by Pausanias, 8.9.3. The Plataea Hera was grouped with a statue of Rhea, also by Praxiteles, Pausanias, 9.2.5.

² Ashmole, 1929,3, plate 12,nos. 1-2.

³ For the Mylasa head see Pollitt, 1972,100, plate 44. For the Samian Hera see Horn, 1972,77-79, plates 1-4.

chryselephantine statue at Olympia and that subsequent sculptors could not hope to improve upon the iconography of Zeus: it had been perfected at Olympia. Admittedly the picture is bleak in the first half of the fourth century B.C., but this must surely be due to the fact that no great temples were built for the god in that period and it is ludicrous to suggest that sculptors did not attempt to develop the iconography of Zeus after Phidias. How far the Olympia cult image actually influenced later cult statues of the god will be an interesting factor when analysing the Hellenistic examples. This is also true for the cult images of Hera and the influence and importance of the statue of her by Polykleitos at Argos. Any changes in the iconography will hopefully be revealed amongst the cult statue fragments from the Hellenistic period.

Returning to the later fourth century, particularly to the time of Alexander, the records for contemporary sculptors and their commissions are slightly more informative. The two most distinguished sculptors in this period were Lysippos and Leochares, and Pliny and Pausanias recorded and described several statues of Zeus by both masters. Leochares is known to have created at least three statues of the god, namely a Zeus Brontaios later in Rome, a Zeus Polieus on the Athenian Acropolis and statues of Zeus and Demos in Piraeus.⁴ Very little is known about the style of Leochares and attempts to attribute surviving originals and copies with his hand are tentative.⁵ The only statue of Zeus associated with the sculptor is a copy found in the temple of the god at Cyrene. This statue, however, appears more like an eclectic, Roman creation than a faithful replica of a

⁴ For the Zeus Brontaios, the Thunderer see Pliny NH.34.79; for the Zeus Polieus, Pausanias, 1.24.4; for the Zeus and Demos, Pausanias, 1.1.3.

⁵ See, Ashmole, 1951(1),13-28 for the relationship between the Demeter of Knidos and Alexander head on the Acropolis.

late fourth century original. The head appears Hellenistic with a long, shaggy mane of hair but the body seems almost Polykleitan in its proportions.⁶

Lysippos made several statues of Zeus during his long career, including a colossal image of the god which stood at Taranto, and Pausanias saw statues of Zeus at Sikyon and Argos both by Lysippos, the latter one possibly being the cult image from the Temple of Zeus at Nemea, but later removed to Argos.⁷ Lysippos also made the statues of Zeus and the Muses at Megara.⁸ None of these survive and no copies can be safely identified with these creations. Hera does not seem to have been a popular choice of deity for these two sculptors. Consequently we have few statues of late Classical originals for the two deities to assess the influence of fourth century prototypes on the iconography of Zeus or Hera. One head that has been associated with Lysippos and Bryaxis is the Otricoli Zeus in the Vatican.⁹ This copy of a late Classical original seems to herald a new fashion for representing the god, with a long mane of hair, brushed high over the forehead and then flowing heavily over the temples, cheeks and neck. This heavy, thick beard and drooping moustache are new elements in the god's iconography, but the facial features are still rather Classical in form, with long Praxitelean eyes. The powerful modelling of the features and hair, however, anticipates the dynamic styles which were to become dominant in the later third century. The significance of the Otricoli head is that it announces a new fashion for representing Zeus, but its features are not the sole criteria for identifying

⁶ For this statue see Paribeni, 1959,78-79, plate 106.

⁷ For the Taranto Zeus, Pliny NH.34.40; Sikyon Zeus, Pausanias, 2.9.6; the Argos Zeus, Pausanias, 2.20.3.

⁸ Pausanias, 1.43.6.

⁹ Picard, 1963,898 and Johnson, 1927.141 noted a similarity between the Zeus and the Apoxyomenos in the treatment of the eyes, forehead and open mouth. Becatti, 1940,22 claimed that the original had more to do with Bryaxis.

Hellenistic Zeus types, but at least demonstrate one particular type. Its importance will only be truly uncovered when it is compared to later images of Zeus. Potential cult images of the early third century may indicate the work of the schools of the late Classical masters but the lack of commissions and historical records, for this period, may make this difficult to define.

The Early Hellenistic Period

The third century is almost as bleak as the fourth as few original cult statues of Zeus and Hera survive, particularly from the first half of the century. Only at Stratos in Akarnania was a temple of considerable size dedicated to Zeus, but unfortunately it was not completed and no record of the cult image exists.¹⁰ All that can be ascertained is that it was constructed during the turn of the century and, for such a significant new temple, it is feasible that a sculptor was commissioned to carve the cult image who was from the workshops of one of the great Classical masters. The sons of Praxiteles and the school of Lysippos were active at this time, but none can be associated with the Stratos temple. In fact, little is known about the sculptors active during the early Hellenistic period. One distinct problem is that of the names of sculptors who could either be predecessors or descendants of Praxiteles. It is not clear whether the cult image of Zeus Soter at Megalopolis was carved by the son or father of Praxiteles who were both named Kephisodotos, but Stewart placed this commission firmly in the hands of the younger sculptor of that name, whereas Pollitt favoured the early fourth century sculptor.¹¹

¹⁰ See Courby and Picard, 1924, for details of this temple.

¹¹ The main problem is the date of the sculptor Xenophon who collaborated with Kephisodotos on this commission. For more on this dilemma see Stewart, 1991,295 and Pollitt, 1990,83-84.

Because of this chronological mystery it would be senseless to dwell upon the question of the cult image of Zeus Soter as a Hellenistic creation. Another of Praxiteles' pupils, named Papylos, made a statue of Zeus Xenios, of Hospitality, which was later to be found in Rome, but no trace of this statue survives either.¹²

Archaeological evidence is also of little help for this period as excavated shrines of the gods tell us little more than the forms of the temples. The temenos of Zeus Olympios at Priene was built in the early Hellenistic period and situated next to the east stoa in the Agora. The temple, probably of the same date, was prostyle in the Ionic order and the stylobate measured 8.50 x 13.50 metres. The base of the cult group in the cella is wide enough to suggest that perhaps two statues stood on the plinth, possibly Zeus with Hera.

The remainder of the third century is slightly less of an enigma than the earlier part but still there is only evidence for two cult images of Zeus, both of which were in Asia Minor. The first at Nikomedeia in Bithynia and the other at Sardis in Lydia.

The Zeus Stratios at Nikomedeia

The cult image of Zeus at Nikomedeia was carved for the new capital of Bithynia under the patronage of King Nikomedes I, and the date of the dedication is reasonably well fixed to the 260's, possibly in 264 B.C., when the capital was founded. Unfortunately the original statue has not survived and numismatic evidence of its appearance has not been universally accepted as reliable. The crucial problem is that of its sculptor. Traditionally

¹² Pliny NH.36.33-34.

the statue has been associated with a sculptor either named Doidalsos or Daidalos. Pliny mentioned a sculptor of the former name who reputedly carved a statue of Aphrodite bathing herself which was made for King Prousius of Bithynia.¹³ Doidalsos may have been commissioned by the kings of Bithynia as court sculptor, and as Pollitt points out, the etymology of the name appears to be of local Bithynian origin.¹⁴ The actual translation of the name of the sculptor appears irrelevant when compared to the problem of identifying the cult image on coins from the city. Coins issued during the reign of king Prousius I (fig.112) show an image of Zeus which is possibly a reproduction of the cult image of Zeus Stratios. Linfert believed that the cult image on these coins is not the statue by Doidalsos, but rather an image of Zeus Nikephoros another possible cult image of that god in the city.¹⁵ Obviously the problem of recognising specific cult images on coins is important here, but one should not rely too heavily on the accuracy of the die caster in faithfully imitating a particular statue. What we can see from the coin image is that the Zeus does not hold a Nike in his outstretched hand, and we should perhaps expect this feature if it copied the cult image preferred by Linfert. It is then reasonable to suppose that it was the Zeus Stratios of Doidalsos that was represented on coins, being the most famous of the two cult images in the city. Therefore we must rely on this coin to assess the style of Doidalsos and the appearance of the cult image.

The god is standing with his weight on his right leg and the left one is relaxed. In his left, raised hand he holds a sceptre and his right, outstretched hand holds an object which is unrecognisable, though clearly not a figure of Nike. There is a vigorous twist in the

¹³ For references to the Aphrodite see the relevant chapter and Pliny NH, 36.35.

¹⁴ Pollitt, 1990,111.

¹⁵ For a summary of Linfert's proposals see Ridgway, 1990,231.

figure of Zeus as he swings to his left, a movement accentuated by the turn of his head towards his outstretched arm. He wears an himation which is draped around his hips and lower legs, which then swings over his left shoulder with the excess material hanging to his left side. The head is held erect with short and curly hair which is conceivably confined in a fillet or wreath, and his beard is short but full. The proportions of the figure are elongated with a firm, but not overstated, musculature. It is possible that the sculptor was still under the influence of the canon of proportions inaugurated by Lysippos and the date of the work would suit a sculptor from his school, perhaps in the later years of their career. Such a mature sculptor from the school of a celebrated late Classical master would be a suitable candidate for court sculptor to a new Hellenistic dynasty, but this is speculation. To locate a style for the Zeus Stratios is perplexing as few original sculptures of this period survive, but a statuette of Zeus found at Kameiros on Rhodes has been cited by Laurenzi as a possible copy of the cult statue at Nikomedeia.¹⁶ A comparison of the statuette with the portrayal of the cult image on the coin shows some convincing analogies. There is a gentle, but conspicuous torsion in the stance of the statuette and the swirl of drapery over the hips, arranged in a similar manner to the coin image, emphasises this strong movement. The statuette has a sinewy and slim musculature which follows the Lysippean canon of proportions. The head is turned lightly to the left and the facial features appear characteristically early Hellenistic. The only noticeable difference between the statuette and the coin is to be found in the hairstyle, as the statuette preserves a longer hairstyle at the back, though admittedly it is not clear whether the Zeus on the coin has his hair loose at the back or confined. The arguments relating the two statues are

¹⁶ See Laurenzi, 1950, fig.2. It is interesting that the author dates the cult image of Zeus Stratios to the decade 250 - 240 B.C. rather than to the date of the founding of the capital city.

extremely persuasive and it is feasible that the Kameiros Zeus is based upon the Stratios Zeus or is, at least, a product of the same general style.

In conclusion all that can be said of the cult image of Zeus at Stratios is that it was a rather imposing figure in a quiet, but current style, which utilised the traits and mannerisms of the schools of the late Classical masters, but also anticipated the indulgences of the Baroque Style which developed in the latter half of the third century B.C. One such piece of sculpture from this latter half of the century, which shows a development into the Baroque style, is the remains of a cult image of Zeus from Sardis.

A statue of Zeus at Sardis (catalogue number 1), figs. 1-2.

The location of a cult of Zeus at Sardis within the temple of Artemis is the subject of controversy and disagreement. That there were at least two cults of the god in the city is obvious from both archaeological and literary evidence. Arrian informs us that Alexander inaugurated a cult of Zeus Polieus at Sardis, the temple of which has not yet been located.¹⁷ Metraux presented the evidence for a cult of Zeus Lydios at Sardis and identifies the image of this cult on two coins, and one of the second century B.C. shows a standing Zeus with his outstretched, left arm holding an eagle and his right hand holding a sceptre. On Hadrianic coins a head of Zeus is depicted which is characterised by its short but full head of curly hair and a luxuriant beard.¹⁸ Little else can be successfully derived from these coin images, but Metraux believes that a cult image of Zeus Lydios was

¹⁷ Arrian, *Anabasis*, 1.17.3.3-6ff.

¹⁸ For this coin see, Metraux, 1971, plate 36, fig.9.

created in the third quarter of the third century and coincidentally the general date of the colossal fragment of the head found near the temple corresponds with his proposed date.¹⁹ Therefore it is possible that the statue which stood in the temple of Artemis was the Zeus Lydios.

George Hanfmann explains that the complete statue could have represented the Seleukid king Achaeos, as he was the only Seleukid of his time to be depicted with a beard.²⁰ Sardis was under Seleukid control in the period 220 - 214 B.C. and a coin hoard found beneath the pedestal of the cult statue dates to this period. If this was the case, it is not certain, from the few insubstantial fragments remaining from the statue, whether the sculpture was intended to represent Achaeos himself, Achaeos in the guise of Zeus or simply Zeus. It may seem unlikely and unparalleled to have such a colossal statue of a reigning monarch erected in the cella of a temple, but not impossible. Thus it is more likely that we have here a statue of Zeus which was perhaps dedicated by a Seleukid monarch, possibly Achaeos.

An enormous fragment of bearded chin, neck and lower face was discovered during the early excavations at Sardis and may belong to the cult image of Zeus. The fragment comes from a statue of colossal proportions and, if seated, the image would have been between 9 - 10 metres in height.²¹ These dimensions, of the restored statue, would suit the scale of the temple but are not proof alone that this is the remains of the cult statue of

¹⁹ Metraux, 1971,158.

²⁰ Hanfmann & Ramage, 1978,104.

²¹ Hanfmann and Frazer, 1975,80 restored the fragment of head to a seated statue of about 5 metres, or to a standing statue of 7 metres. These measurements appear at odds with the section of head measuring 1.10 metres in height.

Zeus. Unfortunately a detailed analysis of the style of the piece is rendered difficult because of the battered nature of the marble and its fragmentary state. The vague aspects of its style that can be determined are, however, interesting and vital to any iconographical survey of the cult images of Zeus from this period. The remnants of locks of hair on the side and back of the neck reveal that the hairstyle was short and not the full mane of hair which is characteristic of the Zeus from Otricoli. The head of the Zeus Lydios on the Hadrianic coin also preserves this short hairstyle and may be a reproduction of the image which stood in the temple of which our fragment is the only surviving piece. Metraux attempts to relate the statue of Zeus Lydios at Sardis to the Zeus at Labraunda, and through his analogy, to the head of Zeus from Mylasa, a possible reproduction of the Labraunda cult image.²² This latter statue was a well-known image and could have been an inspiration for later cult images of Zeus. Furthermore, the Zeus from Mylasa makes an interesting comparison with the Sardis head. The arrangement of the hair and beard is similar, with each lock carefully isolated, and then the hair is built up into a thick, well organised mass of curls. The locks forming the beard of the Sardis Zeus are slightly shorter and more spherical, but an intricate modelling is a characteristic of both beards.

The only other discernible stylistic feature of the head is the modelling of the muscles in the neck. The robust form and solidity of the muscles in the neck are the product of a sculptor who was aware of the emergence of the Baroque style in sculpture. There are no sculptures of this period on such a colossal scale as the Sardis cult image, but the significance is that the sculptor operated to the latest fashions and was not restricted by religious conservatism and thus created a modern image of the god. For such a colossal

²² Metraux, 1971, 156-7.

sculpture as the Sardis Zeus to have been carved in such a meticulous manner is remarkable, but understandable considering the large and prominent temple in which it was placed and the importance of the cult itself; it was a cult image worthy of such a magnificent temple. The significance of this battered but informative cult image is that, in terms of style, the head is a precursor of the mature Baroque style typified by Pergamene sculptures and it acts as a fine mediator between the quieter images of the mid third century and the more dynamic styles prevalent in the late third century and during the first half of the second century B.C.

The Second Century B.C.

The scarcity of evidence for cult images of Zeus, and particularly Hera, during the early Hellenistic period, and the lack of information concerning the iconography of the two deities would be all the more desolate but for the abundance of second century material. All the fragments were either discovered, or seem to have their origins, in Asia Minor. For Zeus we have several splendid cult images and for Hera two pieces which were probably produced in the workshops of Asia Minor, but their original contexts are unidentified. One of the major drawbacks is to define a secure date for each piece, and only the Magnesia and Pergamene cult statues can be dated externally, primarily from the secure dates of the temples. Reasonably fixed points within the first half of the second century are provided only by the Great Altar sculptures at Pergamon, but the date of this enterprise is hardly secure and the Gigantomachy has been dated from the 190's to the late 160's. Nonetheless, some of its characteristics can be of help in terms of stylistic comparison, for instance, the modelling and execution of particular features, such as

drapery styles, facial features, the representation of hair and the anatomical interpretation of the nude parts of the body. These characteristics may help to indicate a date for other works during the period of its construction. One of the few cult images which is externally dated by the temple in which it was dedicated is the cult image of Zeus Sosipolis.

The Zeus Sosipolis at Magnesia on the Maeander (catalogue number 2), figs. 3-4

The earliest datable cult image from the second century B.C. is the Zeus Sosipolis from Magnesia. The temple in which it stood measured 15.82 x 7.30 metres and was probably constructed about 197 B.C. according to an inscription found at the site, and the cult image dedicated shortly afterwards.²³ It was situated in the centre of the Agora, west of * the Artemis precinct and is a small Ionic prostyle temple with four columns at the front, corresponding to two in antis at the rear.

A coin from the city shows Zeus with his right outstretched hand holding an image of Artemis Leukophryene and a sceptre in his left, raised hand (fig. 113). The remnants of the cult image seem to loosely follow the statue represented on the coins. The pose is based upon the Olympian Zeus by Phidias, but that is where the Classical elements of the style of the Zeus Sosipolis end. The statue can be compared in stylistic terms to other sculptures from workshops in Asia Minor.

²³ See Linfert, 1976,29 for details of the dedicatory inscription.

The arrangement of the drapery around the upper thigh is treated in a similar manner to a seated, female statue, no. 62 from Pergamon.²⁴ Özgan noted this similarity and stressed that the folds are rendered in such a manner as to appear shallow and naturalistic, being carved in a different manner to the figures on the Pergamene Gigantomachy, where pleats in the drapery are formed by deep undercutting and have a more plastic appearance. The treatment of the naked torso reveals a strength of form but not an exaggeration of the musculature. The sculptor also indicated the signs of age in the Zeus with the slightly spreading waistline and hips, but not at the expense of portraying physical vitality. This characteristic swelling at the waist level is also a feature of several other seated male deities, for example the Getty Zeus and also the Cherchel Asklepios. The similarities between both the Magnesia and Getty Zeus are only superficial, however, and consist of the pose and arrangement of the drapery. The two heads are extremely different. The Magnesia head is fragmentary, but enough remains to reveal its general style. The hair is composed of long strands which are relatively straight when compared to the Getty Zeus. On this latter image the locks are shorter and form thicker clusters of hair. The Magnesia Zeus has a high forehead with the hair combed back over the brow and then brushed away from the temples, whereas, the Getty Zeus has a flatter forehead and the hair hangs low over the brow and then flows in luxuriant locks down over the temples. The Magnesia Zeus compares even less favourably with the slightly later Trojan Zeus. If there are any comparisons the only head even remotely similar is the Otricoli Zeus which retains the furrowed brow, long mane of hair and a beard of similar design. Watzinger noted the similarity between the two pieces and associates the Otricoli head with Lysippos.²⁵ The

²⁴ Winter, 1908, I, 94-5, plate 22.

²⁵ Köhte and Watzinger, 1904, 183.

Magnesia head, however, adheres more to the principles of the Baroque style in sculpture and therefore is far removed from the intentions of Lysippos and his school. The Aegira Dionysos has a similar form but the modelling of the skin and facial features is harsher and more linear, whereas on the Magnesia head the flesh is shown as distinct from the muscle and bone over which it lies.

The importance of the style of the Magnesia Zeus is that, together with the Trojan and Getty Zeus, it reveals that several currents and sculptural techniques were in operation in the period of the first half of the century. The elements of the three Zeus figures are all fundamentally different in their inspiration, design and plastic treatment. Perhaps the only principle which unites the pieces is that they follow the seated type of Zeus favoured by Phidias, but any direct comparisons with this Classical cult image cannot be corroborated by the simple fact that they are all so dissimilar.

Other sculptures from Magnesia demonstrate a comparable treatment of the drapery. For instance the figures from the Altar of Artemis, probably to be dated to the last quarter of the third century, have a quiet and naturalistic arrangement of the garments without the excessive undercutting of the Great Altar Gigantomachy, but Özgan suggests that the Magnesia Zeus is similar to Pergamene sculptures.²⁶ The general style of the Zeus Sosipolis, however, would fit equally well with those sculptures which pre-date the Great Altar, or are at least contemporary with that monument. Thus it seems reasonable to state that the styles of the earlier half of the second century B.C. were varied, but cannot be successfully confined to any particular decade or geographical position.

²⁶ Özgan, 1982,200.

The feature which indicates a date in the earlier part of the century for the Magnesia Zeus is the treatment of the flesh on the face. The skin is soft and the cheeks and chin quite fleshy and this contrasts effectively with the deeper drilling between the strands of hair. In this respect it is similar to the Sardis Zeus and the Asklepios from Melos. It is not, however, completely accurate to label the sculptor of the Zeus Sosipolis as a transitional sculptor who was mid-way between the third century styles and the mature Baroque style, typified by the Pergamene Gigantomachy, but elements of both styles are evident in the cult image. Overall, a date early in the second century B.C. would be appropriate for the carving and dedication of the statue.

The entire cult image would have been an obvious choice for a statue of City Zeus, seated, paternal and powerfully formed. Inside the small temple, the figure would have appeared prominent, almost reaching the roof, as reconstructed the height of the seated figure was about 3.00 metres. The reconstruction in the Magnesia excavation report earlier this century, however, relied too much on simply re-creating the Phidian Zeus at Olympia.²⁷ The Hellenistic qualities of the piece are ignored and reveal that it is all too facile to categorise all seated Zeus types as derivative and in imitation of the most famous Classical statue of the god. A development from the semi-Baroque style of the Magnesia Zeus is the Trojan Zeus, perhaps the most conspicuous monument to Zeus in the High Hellenistic Style.

²⁷ See Watzinger and Kohte, 1904, fig 166.

The Trojan Zeus (catalogue number 20), figs. 65-67.

The Trojan head of Zeus is, beyond doubt, the most visually impressive of all the surviving Hellenistic cult images of the god examined in this section. It is equally the most understudied and underrated of the representations of Zeus from any period. It has been relegated by some scholars to the ranks of the later Roman "Jupiter" types, but none of these equal the Trojan head in quality or effect. Similar heads of Hellenistic date are rare and given its lack of context, being found amongst the rubble of the temple of Athena, it is difficult to assess its function, but it may well have been a cult image.

The best parallel with the Zeus from Troy is with the head of "Alexander" from Pergamon, now in Istanbul.²⁸ This head, though obviously a posthumous portrait, follows the same general principles of carving and design as the Zeus. The two heads must either be the product of the same school or even be the work of the same sculptor. The Alexander head is best described as being in the tradition of a Lysippean portrait, but having a thoroughly Hellenistic re-working. This portrait is idealistic but fully impregnated with emotion and pathos. The association with Lysippos must end with the simple suggestion that he was one of the few sculptors permitted to carve Alexander's likeness. The sculptor at Pergamon was probably aware of some of Lysippos' portrayals of Alexander but used his own unique and vibrant style to create a posthumous portrait in an up-to-date manner. The Zeus from Troy follows a similar pattern. The pathos is moderated to a degree more suitable for a deity, but if the relationship of the Zeus from

²⁸ For a discussion of the head and its relation to the Gigantomachy at Pergamon see Radt, 1981, 583-596.

Otricoli to Lysippos or Bryaxis can be believed then the Zeus from Troy may be an elaboration of a Zeus by an early Hellenistic master sculptor. The Zeus from Troy continues the type of Zeus typified by the Otricoli head, but again modernises its general appearance.

On closer inspection the Alexander and the Zeus have many similarities. The eyes are small with heavy, fleshy lids, the only difference being that the eyes of Alexander roll upwards and indicate a more restless mood. The open mouths are a similar feature of both heads and there is a strong definition of the cheekbones and brow. The heads have a massive, quadrilateral structure with stocky necks, square jawlines and broad cheeks. The most obvious stylistic parallel, however, is the modelling of the hair. The Zeus has a distinct hairstyle in which the thick strands are swept backwards in two broad divisions, which then form a high arch over the head and hang down the face in isolated curls which are drilled underneath and hang heavily over the cheeks. The Alexander preserves a similar, but shorter hairstyle. The manner in which it is carved perhaps indicates royalty, its association with a lion's mane further enhances this particular hairstyle as being kingly. The only other comparable head of Zeus belongs to a statuette found at Pergamon which Winter compares to the Zeus from Otricoli, but is closer to the Trojan Zeus.²⁹ In this statuette Zeus is shown seated and the type of body used may provide an indication for that used on the restored Trojan Zeus. The statuette preserves a massive musculature and a powerful heavy build which is directly associated with the figures on the Gigantomachy frieze from Pergamon. Through this comparison, and that with the Alexander head, the

²⁹ The statuette is now in Berlin, height 0.46 metres, preserved from head to waist. See Winter, 1908, II, no 185.

Trojan Zeus can be directly linked with other sculptures found at Pergamon. It must not be assumed that the Trojan Zeus was the work of a Pergamene sculptor, merely that its sculptor worked in that city and most likely was one of the many craftsmen who executed the Gigantomachy. This analogy helps us to locate a date for the Trojan Zeus within the second century.

Suggested dates for the Trojan Zeus are rare as it has been all too often neglected in scholarly works. Those few dates which have been proposed range from late third century to Hadrianic; the latter date, recently assigned to the piece by Landwehr, is certainly too late and appears to be the result of haphazardly associating the head with later heads of "Jupiter".³⁰ This latest analysis of the head, being somewhat brief, seems to misinterpret the characteristics of the Zeus and the author fails to consider the altogether Hellenistic Baroque aspects of the head. Vermeule and Mendel both favoured a mid to late Hellenistic date for the head, but did not attempt to explore possible analogies which may have indicated a more secure date. Careful study reveals similarities with several Pergamene works, particularly on the Great Altar friezes.

Significant parallels can be detected on the Gigantomachy from Pergamon. The rendering of the hair, in carefully delineated, but not mechanically formed locks, is a feature of many of the figures on the frieze. Notable similarities are to be found on the giant opposing Dione, the Helios and some of the female deities, particularly the first of the Moira.³¹ Furthermore, the facial features of the Zeus have the same basic structure as

³⁰ Landwehr, 1990,107.

³¹ For these figures see Schmidt, 1962, for the Helios, plate 21; the opponent of Dione, plate 54; the first of the Moira, plate 58.

these heads. Small, long eyes are a common feature of the Giant Otos on the east side, Helios on the south side and the opponent of Dione and the goddess Nyx/Kore on the north side. These heads come from the slightly quieter and less extravagant figures on the frieze, compare for example the giants in the Athena and Zeus groups.³² The masters of these quieter groups did not exaggerate the features and this impression is also a feature of the Trojan Zeus. There are also analogies with figures on the Telephos frieze from the interior of the Great Altar. Notable stylistic links are to be found in the head of Teuthras, comparable features being the hairstyle and the form of the beard. Even closer than the Teuthras, or indeed the statuette of Zeus from Pergamon, is a small statue of Poseidon found near the Altar.³³ This statue may have originally formed part of the Great Altar programme of sculpture and could have decorated the roof of the monument along with other statues of deities. The similarities begin with the hair which, on the Poseidon, is rendered in a rather lank fashion but not unlike the Trojan Zeus. The facial features have a certain mildness which is similar to the Zeus, but have more in common with the Teuthras on the Telephos frieze. Altogether the Zeus compares well to these pieces and to the less extreme figures on the larger frieze, but in terms of date, a secure chronology depends on whether the Telephos frieze is later in date than the Gigantomachy or contemporary but carved in a different, more restrained style suitable for the theme portrayed. Schober recognises the link between the Teuthras and the Poseidon, but does not attempt to compare either to the Trojan Zeus. He refers to these sculptures as coming from a period when sculptors reacted against the excesses of the Baroque Style and, in this respect, Alscher agrees that the years 160 - 140 produced sculptures which were more

³² Particularly the Alkyoneos; see Schmidt, 1962, plate 42.

³³ See Schober, 1951, 64.

restricted in their pretensions and that this was a natural progression after the Baroque movement had climaxed in the Gigantomachy. He continues to refer to sculptures produced in the middle years of the century as "lacking dynamism" and disparagingly classifies them as belonging to the *flabby style*, a category that the author invents.³⁴ In reality this natural progression of sculptural styles does not exist and it is possible that different streams and fashions co-existed and it is difficult to define a chronological development based exclusively on style.

That the Trojan Zeus is comparable to figures on both the larger and smaller friezes of the Great Altar may reveal that the two friezes are not as far removed in time as once thought. Most scholars postulate a late date for the Telephos frieze, either during the later years of Eumenes II's reign, that is about 160/159 B.C., or in the reign of Attalos II. It is even possible that work on the frieze continued into the reigns of Attalos II and III and that it was not finished due to the latter king's untimely death.³⁵ Kahler proposes a distinct chronological gap between the carving of the large and small friezes, dating the Gigantomachy between 182 - 165 and the Telephos frieze to 164 - 158 B.C.³⁶ A more satisfactory speculation is that the Telephos frieze was an important part of the general scheme of the monument and that its differing, though not incompatible, style was due to its contrasting subject matter. Robertson believes that the smaller frieze is later than the Gigantomachy, but not by a great interval of time.³⁷ In conclusion, a date somewhere in the second quarter of the second century would probably be the most accurate for some of

³⁴ For Schober's analysis of these sculptures see Schober, 1951. Also Alscher, 1957,85-89.

³⁵ For this argument see Pollitt, 1986.198.

³⁶ For this theory see Havelock, 1981.199.

³⁷ Robertson, 1975,197.

the figures on the Gigantomachy, the Telephos frieze and the Trojan Zeus. Thus the head provides a link between the sculptors who were commissioned to work at Pergamon and the patronage of sculptors in other cities in Asia Minor. It also reflects the importance of types probably created by Lysippos in its association with the head of Alexander. This, however, does not help us to determine the importance of the Trojan Zeus as a cult image.

Excavations at Troy have so far not revealed any temple dedicated to Zeus, so the Trojan head has no precise context and its function has not been determined. It is possible that, if the head is a remnant of a cult image, it may have stood within the temple of Athena, where it was found, as a secondary cult image. It would, however, have appeared odd next to the Archaic image of Athena Ilias. There is no literary evidence for a joint cult between the two deities but it is a possibility. The only other evidence as to any form of cult image of Zeus in the city is that found on coins.

A seated image of Zeus Idaeos is shown on later Roman coins issued during the reign of Julia Domna and Faustina (fig. 114). The god leans his right raised arm on a long sceptre and the other hand carries a small, standing image of Athena Ilias. This at least shows some sort of relationship between the two deities at Troy, but it could also show that the seated Zeus on the coin was not an actual cult figure which stood in the city, but rather a general representation of the god. This is possible but it may be that such an image was made for a temple within the city.

To return to the actual coin, the Zeus is shown with his lower body draped in an himation, which also appears to cover his back. The musculature of the torso is of a powerful type,

typical of Hellenistic sculpture of the first half of the second century B.C., and is thus contemporary with the head of the Trojan Zeus. What is discernible of the head shows that it had long, curly hair and perhaps had a band securing the locks, again similar to the marble head of Zeus. The date and location of the original cult image, on which the coin depiction is based, is unknown. The Zeus Idaeos is only recorded on coins of the Roman period and it is possible that the statue and cult are a creation of this period. The features of the statue on the coin, however, reveal that, if it was a Roman invention, it followed the styles of the high Hellenistic period and has something in common with the general design and form of statues made at Pergamon. On the whole the statue appears to have much more in common with Hellenistic methods of sculptural design than Roman creations. The Trojan Zeus adheres to the same principles of form as the Zeus on the coin, but this is not to say that it is a fragment of the cult image of Zeus Idaeos. However, it is our only evidence as to an important cult image of the god in the city. Only the colossal size of the Trojan head provides any evidence for it originally being part of a cult image.

The Trojan Zeus is a superb example of a Hellenistic Baroque style cult image of the god. It is our finest preserved representation of the god from the period. In stylistic terms it resembles statues and sculptures found at Pergamon and must be the work of one of the sculptors who worked on the Great Altar decoration. The dynamism, so obvious in the Gigantomachy, has been moderated to a degree, but the sculptor nonetheless formulated an animated image which perhaps utilised older, early Hellenistic models. More importantly the sculptor was also an innovator and his style manifested itself in an image which is fervently intense but noble nonetheless. The type of the Trojan Zeus exerted a major

influence over later Roman portrayals of Jupiter which also preserve the long mane of curly hair. This head of Zeus contrasts effectively with the head of the Getty Zeus which has Baroque allusions, but is a calmer, more Classical image that reveals how many different yet contemporary styles could co-exist in the first half of the second century B.C.

The Getty Zeus (catalogue number 33), figs. 101-102.

The Getty Zeus is a fine copy of an original, which was possibly dated somewhere in the first half of the second century B.C., thus being contemporary with the Gigantomachy of the Great Altar. Vermeule dates the piece to about 160 B.C. and proposes that the original was either made at Pergamon or was commissioned by another city in western Asia Minor, but carved by a sculptor who had worked at Pergamon.³⁸ The statue certainly has affinities with sculptures found in the city and the heavy musculature recalls the physiques of the gods on the Gigantomachy. It bears a resemblance to the Magnesia Zeus in posture, but is a more restless figure and the head, in particular, is of a very different style. The hair is shorter with the locks lying flatter on the forehead rather than being swept back over the crown in longer, more unruly locks, like the Magnesia and Trojan heads. The late third century, standing Asklepios from the Altar at Magnesia retains a similar hairstyle with a row of locks hanging in layers from the temples to the chin. The facial features of the Asklepios are unfortunately damaged and whether it was carved with a similar tense surface of skin over the prominent bone structure below is

³⁸ Vermeule, 1985,43. The statue may have been made for a Roman patron in the Pergamene style, like the Capitoline Hera.

uncertain. This feature is distinguishable in both the Getty Zeus and the Poseidon of Melos, which is perhaps of a slightly later date.

The physiques of both the Zeus and Poseidon are also comparable. The musculature is powerful yet moderate in form with a distinct definition of the anatomical forms beneath the skin. The modelling is dry with an emphasis on clear transitions between the muscles of the chest and abdomen. The Poseidon is slightly leaner, but this could merely be due to his standing position. A significant comparison can be found in the arrangement of the drapery, as on both statues the himation is bundled up onto one shoulder in a small accumulation of folds. This arrangement is commonly found in male figures throughout the Hellenistic period and may therefore not be a secure dating mechanism, yet it is perhaps more common within the second century B.C., particularly in the latter half.

Another copy which is almost identical to the Getty Zeus is the Asklepios in Copenhagen, which preserves the same seated pose to that of Zeus.³⁹ Landwehr notes this important resemblance and highlights the problem in identifying the Getty statue as a Zeus, and it is possible that this type of body was used for statues both of Zeus and Asklepios.⁴⁰ The head of the Asklepios statue is certainly very different to that of Zeus and betrays a classicising face which is totally distinct from the Baroque features of the Zeus. The Zeus appears to be a more faithful copy of a Hellenistic original than the Asklepios and its inspiration probably comes from western Asia Minor. Vermeule stresses the rather turbulent modelling of the torso and describes the facial features as "fearsome to

³⁹ For the statue see Holtzmann, 1984, no.45.

⁴⁰ Landwehr, 1990,107.

behold".⁴¹ In doing this, however, he has misinterpreted the expression on the face which is, instead, tolerably benevolent and mild with the head inclined somewhat towards the spectator. There is a touch of sentiment effected by the slightly parted lips and downward turning eyes, and the overriding impression that it gives is one of Olympian majesty, but he is a god who is drawn closer to the people by the bowing of his head. In the chronological development of the type of Zeus during the Hellenistic period it is difficult to locate securely. Like the Trojan Zeus the date depends upon that of the Great Altar as several of its features can be detected on figures on the Gigantomachy frieze and upon the Telephos frieze. The safest and possibly most precise date would be that it was carved during the final years of the Great Altar sculptures, possibly just before 150 B.C. Its stylistic association with the earlier Asklepios from the Magnesia Altar, however, reveals that an earlier date could be applicable; yet its parallels with the Poseidon of Melos, however, show that a slightly later date could also apply. Therefore, the years 200 - 150 B.C. seem the most likely date for the origin of the prototype.

For Hera the picture so far has not been informative as no early Hellenistic cult images of the goddess survive. From the first half of the second century, however, there are two possible Heras which may help us to define an iconographical type for her cult images. Neither statue has an established context, nor are they safely identified as Hera, hence they must be dealt with in a cautionary manner but not overlooked.

⁴¹ Vermeule, 1985,43.

Two second century images of Hera (catalogue numbers 22 and 35), figs. 68 and 104-105.

Two possible cult images, one a complete statue, the other a single head, both reveal the high Hellenistic styles and yet retain the austerity of Hera's Classical images.

Unfortunately, neither of the examples has a secure provenance or context and therefore their use is restricted to the stylistic characteristics they display. Their function is also uncertain, but it can not be ruled out that they both acted as cult images.

A possible fragment of a cult image of Hera is a head, now in Boston, with no fixed provenance and the head constitutes somewhat of a mystery. It has been dated from the late third to the second century B.C., and has unquestionably been labelled a Hellenistic original and identified as either Hera or Demeter, the former suggestion being indicated by the rather severe aspect of the facial features, but by no means being indicative of that goddess.⁴² The problem lies in the fact that few original statues of Hera survive for us to compare the Boston head with. Copies of Classical Heras are rare and tend to reproduce post Phidian statues, possibly from the schools of Alkamenes and Agorakritos. The Barberini type does not significantly identify Hera's personality and may just as easily be recognised as Demeter or even Aphrodite.⁴³ It is more appropriate to view the Boston Hera as an Hellenistic innovation as the style resembles other Hellenistic works rather than Classical statues. The major dilemma in analysing the head as an Hellenistic piece is that Vermeule considers the head to be similar to royal portraits of Ptolemaic queens. Any

⁴² See Vermeule, 1969-70,57.

⁴³ For Barberini type in Vatican see Bieber, 1977, plate 29.

evaluation of the head, however, exposes that it does not possess the characteristics which identify them as portraits. Comparisons with coin portraits often help to identify a particular queen and the Boston head does not compare well to these coin portraits. Furthermore, even the most idealised of portrait heads, such as the Auckland bronze head or the Hirsch Queen, have a slight tendency towards a superficial realism which is not evident in the head of Hera, so we must look for comparisons elsewhere to determine a possible date.⁴⁴

Vermeule considers the Boston head a lively version of the noble, Classical style and thus associates the head with Pergamon and its "classicising school of sculpture".⁴⁵ This is an interesting argument in that it at least attempts to locate a provenance for the statue, but if we are to compare the head to the few sculptures in this so-called style found at Pergamon, the Boston head is revealed as a more innovative, modern work. It bears only a passing resemblance to the statue of Athena with the Cross Aegis, a statue usually cited amongst the classicising Pergamene works.⁴⁶ The similarities are there, but they are shallow and only reveal that the Athena is slightly more Hellenistic than usually thought. The Hera has more in common with the heads of the goddesses on the Gigantomachy frieze from Pergamon. The face of the Artemis has a similar structure to the Hera, both having high, triangular foreheads which are convex in form. The well defined cheekbones and prominent small chins are alike in both examples, as are the upper eyelids which are formed by sharp contours, which contrast with the lower ones that blend softly into the flesh of the upper cheek. Also comparable are the small, short mouths with simply

⁴⁴ For the Auckland head see Smith, 1988, plate 30, nos 1-2 and the Hirsch Queen, plate 37, no 2-3.

⁴⁵ Vermeule, 1969-70,57.

⁴⁶ See Winter, 1908, no.22, 13-25, plates 2-4.

formed, thin lips; only on the Artemis the mouth is opened and the corners raised slightly contrasting with the stern frown of the Hera. The hairstyles are not identical, but are modelled in a similar manner, with the locks constructed out of thick, ropy strands, but rendered slightly more crudely on the Hera. This does not indicate a sculptor of lesser quality, but it is likely that the head was semi-veiled, thus the hair did not require such delicate modelling. The Hera follows the fashions of the day for representations of goddesses. The hair is carved in an elaborate fashion and the modulation of the skin and the tension of skin, flesh and muscle demonstrate that the sculptor was aware of the Baroque style, and that the Classical simplicity of form had been surpassed; it was not his intention to re-create a Hera of the Severe, early Classical style.

There are examples of this type at Pergamon, one parallel piece being a head of a goddess recently restored from two separate fragments.⁴⁷ Brize dates the head to the late Hellenistic period, but stresses that the head was re-worked in the first century B.C. and re-dedicated as an image of Livia in the guise of Demeter.⁴⁸ This identification and supposition is, on the whole, unconvincing and the head bears more of a resemblance to Aphrodite than Demeter, particularly when viewed from the correct angle, that is with the head inclined and bowing to the left. This has the effect of softening the features rather and highlights the importance of restoring heads correctly onto their necks to maintain the original aspect and posture of the head. When viewed frontally, however, the "Aphrodite" is remarkably similar to the Boston Hera. The triangular forehead and crinkly waves of

⁴⁷ The back part of the head is now in Berlin, the front portion is in Bergamo Museum.

⁴⁸ Brize, 1990, 194. The hair was possibly re-cut in the first century B.C. for the addition of a metal wreath and was consequently dedicated as a deified ruler portrait. His explanation for the transformation of the goddess to empress is unconvincing and on the whole the head would suit a statue of Aphrodite or a Muse rather than Demeter.

hair are common to both heads. Also comparable are the prominent cheekbones, long almond shaped eyes and the small mouths. The Boston Hera was, however, originally intended to be viewed from a frontal position and, if the assumption that it belongs to a cult statue is correct, then it would have been viewed from below, the angle depending on whether the image was seated or standing. The fact that the features are so alike, however, helps to locate a date and also perhaps the location of the sculptor's main commissions, that is western Asia Minor.

Elsewhere the Boston Hera finds parallels in sculptures from other cities in Asia Minor. One such piece was excavated at Magnesia on the Maeander and exhibits similar severe tendencies but is also dynamically modelled.⁴⁹ The hair is treated in a comparable manner with a centre parting and the hair waving in regular strands over the ears. Another parallel is a female head found in the sanctuary of Leto at Xanthos. This head can be compared to the goddesses on the Pergamon Gigantomachy and, like the Hera, the facial features are tinged with an austerity which may identify the personality as one of the senior Olympian goddesses, probably Leto.⁵⁰ The "Leto" has its closest analogy in the Nyx/Kore of the north side of the frieze at Pergamon, particularly in the formation of the hair and shape of the face. The importance of these analogies is that each of the aforementioned heads are similar and follow a similar pattern of design and style. Equally critical are the differences found amongst the heads. The Boston Hera, the Pergamon "Aphrodite", the Xanthian "Leto" and the Nyx/Kore all reveal ideosyncracies which indicate that a different sculptor was at work. The differing styles of the groups on the

⁴⁹ See Köhte and Watzinger, 1904,201, fig.201.

⁵⁰ This head is analyzed in detail by Marcade, 1976,113-120.

Gigantomachy at Pergamon are proof that many sculptors worked upon the monument and probably were to continue working in Asia Minor for the next generation or so. The importance of the Boston Hera, to return to the point, is that she has affinities with datable monuments like the Great Altar, that is between 190 - 160 B.C. The austerity of the head would agree with the personality of Hera and with the few identified sculptures of the goddess. In this image, Hera was faithfully captured in a severely beautiful and rigidly composed image.

A more complete statue, possibly a Hera, is to be found in the so-called "Cesi Juno", better referred to as the Capitoline Hera. This statue, of heroic size, is possibly a Hellenistic original or a fine quality copy of the first century B.C., the original of which, however, was certainly by a sculptor who worked primarily in Asia Minor. Interpretations of the statue vary from it being an original Hellenistic work made in Asia Minor, an original second century statue made for a Roman patron, or a first century B.C. copy of a Pergamene original.⁵¹ The carving is not of such high standard as most original Hellenistic works, particularly the treatment of the drapery and the rather dull facial features. Furthermore, the sandals, which Ridgway believes to be very late Hellenistic, may corroborate a later date, but the style of footwear is perhaps not reason enough to date a statue within the Hellenistic or early Roman period.

There are many comparable, draped female statues and the style was not exclusive to Pergamon. In fact at Magnesia on the Maeander the large altar has parallel figures in

⁵¹ Özgan, 1982,202, believes that it is a copy of a Pergamene original and Ridgway, 1990, 357 suggests that it was made for a location in Rome in a loose Hellenistic style.

terms of style and design. The figures on the frieze have an elaborate drapery arrangement with a particular emphasis on the use of the so-called "press folds", a feature prominent on the Capitoline Hera. Interpretations of this feature vary widely and range from the marks being guidelines for painted patterns, a theory suggested by Linfert, to Ridgway's proposal that the marks are the result of folding the garments in storage to help retain their shape.⁵² The first of these two theories seems rather remote from the truth and the latter perhaps more promising. Whatever the actual cause of this drapery feature is, its importance as a dating mechanism is rather inadequate but, on the whole, it is found in sculptures from sites in western Asia Minor and helps to locate the Capitoline Hera in that region. Özgan endeavours to associate the drapery style of the Magnesia Altar figures with the Hera. He cites several comparable features, such as the elongated appearance of the lower body and the effect of revealing the prominent leg through the heavy material. This is indeed a convincing analogy, but it is a feature common to many sculptures dated from the late third to second century B.C. To find a closer equivalent statue we need to locate a similar drapery composition.

The arrangement of garments is compatible with many female figures found at Pergamon. The high girdled bosom and the bunch of material wrapped tightly around the waist are also a feature of the so-called "Tragoidia" now in Berlin.⁵³ Winter emphasizes that the two statues have a close relationship and must be of similar date, but, in fact the drapery style of the two statues is very different. The Tragoidia has a more tightly bunched up himation which, rather than surrounding her waist as on the Hera, envelops her hips and

⁵² See Ridgway, 1990,219, for Linfert's arguments.

⁵³ See Winter, 1908, 76, no.47.

upper legs. The Tragoidia also appears less elongated in comparison with the proportions of Hera. Another female figure from Pergamon has a similar arrangement of the chiton and high girdle, but the design of the lower himation is again very different.⁵⁴ The problem is that of all the many female, draped statues no two are identical and that makes it very difficult to give them a secure date or place them in a chronological development. There is a case to be said for the Capitoline Hera being dated slightly later than the previous two in that her clothes are less bulky and massive than on the Tragoidia in particular. The Hera seems less burdened by drapery than some of the goddesses on the Gigantomachy from Pergamon. Yet the styles of drapery vary on this frieze and the unwieldy garments worn by some of the goddesses on the frieze are balanced by those who wear less cumbersome attire. Examples are the Rhea on the south side, Aphrodite on the north side and the Amphitrite on the west.⁵⁵ The himation on these figures tends to lie flatter against the body with a hint of the contours of the waists, hips and legs. This is an obvious feature of the Hera's drapery and an even more distinctive feature is the pattern formed by the himation.

On the Capitoline statue, the himation forms two distinct triangular panels which are rendered in a flat, but still elaborate, manner. In this respect her most obvious counterpart is the statue of Zeus from the temple of Hera at Pergamon. Another feature which she has in common with the Zeus is the slight torsional movement and the elongated appearance of her body. The arrangement of the himation around the thighs is particularly close on the two statues. The hem of the garment rolls up to form a loose coil of folds, but the

⁵⁴ Winter, 1908, no.53.

⁵⁵ For the goddesses on the Great Altar Gigantomachy see Schmidt, 1962, Rhea, plate 25; Aphrodite, plate 40 and Amphitrite, plate 31.

depth of the carving is nowhere near as deep as on the Tragoidia or the figures on the Pergamene Gigantomachy. Beneath this roll of material hang two flat, triangular panels of material with obvious "press marks" and considerable, yet not excessive, pleating. As already mentioned, there is an indication in both the Hera and the Zeus of the forms of the body beneath the drapery, but only a slight hint. The two statues must date to the same period even if the chronology is based upon stylistic comparisons rather than archaeological or historical fact, but the common manifestations of certain features, the arrangement of their himations for example, are not widespread motifs in drapery design and this analogy seems a viable method for a closer dating.

Another similarity between the Hera and the Zeus are the proportions and posture of the statues. There is a sense of a precarious balance in their bearings, and there is a strong twist of upper and lower body which emphasizes the hips, and the figures step forwards with a vigorous movement. This twist is advanced even further in the slightly later statues of Aphrodite and Poseidon from Melos, but these are more static in design. The Zeus will be discussed in more detail shortly but his date must be during the reign of Attalos II, that is between 160/59-138 B.C. Thus the Hera probably dates from within this period and probably is more accurately dated in the early years of the king's reign, say between 160-150 B.C. due to its affinities with some of the figures on the Gigantomachy from Pergamon.

A final judgement of the two possible cult images of Hera, shows that the Boston Hera, and the original on which the Capitoline statue was based, were probably carved by sculptors working in cities in Asia Minor and the closest parallels come from Pergamon.

The two heads show distinct similarities to each other and can be compared to the heads of goddesses on the Great Altar Gigantomachy frieze. The Heras have a more austere appearance due to the personality portrayed. These two types are similar in that they both follow contemporary trends in sculptural style and are not easy to compare to earlier, Classical statues and by no means reproduce the Argive Hera by Polykleitos. It has not been easy to see how influential this famous cult image of Hera was due to the lack of Hellenistic evidence. The only example of Hera having a Hellenistic temple dedicated solely in her honour is at Pergamon, but ironically the only cult image which survives from the temple represents Zeus, acting as her royal and divine counterpart.

The Zeus from Pergamon and the Smyrna Zeus (catalogue numbers 3 and 34), figs. 5-7 and 103.

The small but prominently positioned temple of Hera Basileia at Pergamon was built between 160/159 - 138 B.C. during the reign of Attalos II according to the dedicatory inscription. The complex consists of a grand staircase, leading to the four columned * prostyle temple of the Doric order. The whole shrine was intended to be viewed from a distance and was essentially a facade, with the interior building materials being of a lower standard of carving. In this respect it shows a fine example of Hellenistic architectural planning, with its spectacular outer appearance being at the expense of interior refinements. Inside the small cella, measuring 5.80 x 6.80 metres were found a series of statue bases and a few fragments of the cult images and other sculptures. The best preserved of these is a headless male figure of heroic size which could be identified as the cult statue of Zeus or of Attalos. The current director of excavations at Pergamon favours

the latter identification and bases this solely on the grounds that the figure appears to have had short hair, remnants of which can only now be seen at the back of the head.⁵⁶ This view is the result of the common misconception that the typical late Classical or Hellenistic iconography of Zeus follows the type found in copies such as the Otricoli Zeus in the Vatican which have a head of thick, curly, long hair, hanging in the so-called royal anastole. That this is not always the case can be proved by the late Classical Zeus from Mylasa, with his short, wavy hair or the fragment of the Zeus head from Sardis and even in copies, such as the Getty Zeus.

Further evidence as to the statue's identification can be gleaned from a little known figure of Zeus found at Smyrna and now in the Louvre.⁵⁷ In almost every respect this figure is an exact replica of the Pergamon statue. The figure is Roman in date, but is finely conceived and by a sculptor of great technical ability. The pose, arrangement of drapery and positioning of the arms closely echoes the Pergamon figure. The feet are the main difference in that the Louvre statue has bare feet and not the elaborate sandals of its Hellenistic model. The hair hangs loosely over the shoulders, but only just touches the sides of the neck, and the Pergamene figure could also have had long hair, but again hanging free of the neck. The facial features of the Louvre statue are carved in a vigorous manner with a heavy brow, broad cheeks and a large nasal ridge. The hair is also animated by the action of the sweeping locks over the temples and in the full and curly beard. It could indeed be argued that the Pergamon statue was Attalos, but modelled on an earlier figure of Zeus, from which the later statue at Smyrna was copied. With the loss

⁵⁶ Radt, 1988,216.

⁵⁷ Horn, 1931, plate 20,no.3.

of the head of the Pergamene statue, however, the identification is difficult, but it stood next to the seated statue of Hera and continues a traditional iconography of the god Zeus so may be more accurately identified as the god.

As mentioned in the section concerning the Capitoline Hera, the statue of Zeus has parallels in sculptures probably dated to the earlier part of Attalos II's reign. The main image in the temple was, however, the statue of Hera Basileia of which the only fragment of comparable size with the Zeus is a hand.⁵⁸ Whether the image was seated or standing is not clear, but the present director believes that she was seated although no indication for a throne exists and there is a general confusion as to how many images stood upon the three bases surviving in the temple.⁵⁹ One of the most satisfactory restorations would be for Hera to be seated on the central base with two figures flanking her, possibly Zeus with another deity, perhaps Hebe. Figures of Attalos II and his wife, Stratonike are possibly to be restored to the pedestals on either side of the cella, and if this was the case, it would have been the result of a conscious policy of emulating the divine married couple, a method used for legitimising authority. The arrangement of cult figures in the cella demonstrates a calculated move on the part of the king and queen and provides an astute example of the ways in which the Hellenistic Dynasts utilised cults and particular deities to validate their rule. The four or five statues must have created an overwhelming display within the small cella. They stood on high bases and surrounded the worshipper and, if

⁵⁸ This is possibly from the cult image and it could not be from the other female statue which stood on the right hand base as one entered the temple, the lower half of which survives, because it is on a larger scale. See Ippell, 1912, 320.

⁵⁹ See Radt, pers.corr. 14th April 1992.

they were all carved in such a vibrant manner as the Zeus, the group would be a spectacular sight.

A general consensus of opinion would classify the statue of Zeus as derivative. Schober stresses that the drapery design is traditional for the god, but cites no examples to verify his observations.⁶⁰ Fifth century statues of Zeus, such as the central figure in the east pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia and the copies of the Dresden Zeus, have a vaguely analogous drapery arrangement, but not as distinct as the Pergamene Zeus.⁶¹ Carpenter goes one step further and claims that an early fourth century model inspired the pose of the Zeus from Pergamon, but again provides no particular prototype. He continues to say that the drapery is traditional in its arrangement but not in its appearance.⁶² In fact the drapery is thoroughly Hellenistic in both design and appearance. Carpenter describes the garments as "visually stunning" and cites the Nike of Samothrake as his female counterpart. The most striking characteristic of the statue's drapery is the method of undercutting the folds which has the effect of creating dark seams of shadow which contrast with the flatter and smoother areas of the garment. This design is clearly seen in the thigh and lower leg area where the contours of the left leg are seen pressing against the material, which clings to the thigh. This is effectively framed on the right leg which is covered by curvilinear ridges of material which are divided by deeply cut channels. This posture and drapery device is a feature common to the Capitoline Hera and the Poseidon of Melos, though less competently rendered on the

⁶⁰ Schober, 1951,204.

⁶¹ For the pedimental figure of Zeus see Ashmole and Yalouris, 1967 and for the type of the Dresden Zeus see Stewart, 1991,270.

⁶² Carpenter, 1960,204.

latter. The Zeus is the most heavily draped of all associated statues of this period and is one of the most visually striking of cult images from the mid second century B.C. This visual display is enhanced by the contrast between the material of the himation and the naked upper torso.

The naked chest and abdomen are rendered in a strong but not exaggerated manner. In this respect it is totally dissimilar to the Zeus on the Gigantomachy frieze from Pergamon. On this latter Zeus every muscle, tendon and vein are swollen to the extreme complementing the immense vitality, movement and the strength of the deity. Other figures on the frieze, however, are not so heavily muscled. This less inflated treatment of the muscles is most evident on the figures of Triton, Okeanos and Nereus on the west side of the monument.⁶³ The muscles of the sea gods on the Gigantomachy are less overstated than the Zeus on the east frieze and the drapery too is carved in a quieter fashion. The Zeus also contrasts effectively with the Asklepios from Mounychia which should be dated to the first decades of the second century B.C.⁶⁴ The torso of the Zeus is less firm and the flesh seems softer when compared to this statue, and the skin lies loosely over the sub-surface anatomical features. In this respect it compares well to the statue of Alexander found at Magnesia and now in Istanbul, with the arrangement of the himation also similar on both statues.⁶⁵ A final characteristic which unites many statues of this date is the technique in which they were constructed. The Zeus Basileus and the statues of Poseidon, Amphitrite and Aphrodite from Melos were carved from several pieces of marble and the upper and lower bodies joined together just above the hip level

⁶³ For these figures see Schmidt, 1962, plate 29.

⁶⁴ See the relevant section on Asklepios.

⁶⁵ See Pollitt, 1986, fig.19 for the Alexander.

except for the Amphitrite which is joined under the bust. Normally sculptures pieced together would have a join between the naked torso and the draped legs and therefore they may all belong to a similar chronological method of construction. That the Zeus from the temple of Hera still adheres to the general principles of the Baroque style would perhaps suggest a date earlier in the reign of Attalos II than later, probably between 160 - 150 B.C., as sculptures made after this period tend to reveal quieter and more simplistic arrangements of drapery and a less dynamic treatment of the naked parts. The Louvre Zeus from Smyrna is certainly the best parallel for the Pergamene Zeus and its powerfully modelled facial features and Baroque head also show that the original on which it was based was either the statue at Pergamon, or a similar figure of the same date.

Overall the sculptor of the Zeus appears to have formed his style from the last vestiges of the Baroque style in the mid second century B.C., but he has modified the excesses of the Gigantomachy at Pergamon. This vibrant style was suitable for such a cult image and the design of the statue was a popular choice for other senior Olympians and ruler portraits, like the posthumous statue of Alexander. The cult group in the temple of Hera was augmented by standing images perhaps of Attalos and his queen. The interest here is that the statue of Zeus shows an extremely high standard of carving which contrasts with the rather weak architectural carvings on the temple. For this period we must rely on only one group of cult images on the island of Delos and here Zeus shared his sanctuary with Athena. Other than this we have information about only one cult statue of Zeus, that by the sculptor Eukleides at Aegira in Achaia.

The Zeus by Eukleides at Aegira

A difficult cult image to place chronologically within the Hellenistic period is the Zeus by Eukleides at Aegira. Pausanias is our only source concerning this cult statue which is almost universally believed to have survived in two fragments found in Naiskos D in the ancient city.⁶⁶ For reasons, however, best explained in the section concerning Dionysos, these fragments will be analysed later. The problem here concerns a possible date for the sculptor now that he has been dissociated from the fragments from Aegira and therefore his style is not known through surviving sculpture. Madigan, the perpetrator of the re-identification of the Aegira head, concludes that the sculptor must be re-dated to the fourth century B.C.⁶⁷ There is, however, no proof that Eukleides was a Classical sculptor, as many of these Achaean cities were architecturally embellished during the zenith of the Achaean League's domination in the region, that is during the third and early second centuries B.C. It is perhaps reasonable to assume that after the dissolution of the Achaean League in 146 B.C., few cities in the region would have been wealthy enough to commission cult images, so an earlier date may be more appropriate, though not necessarily much earlier. It is difficult to determine the exact date of the sculptor as no fragments of his cult statues have been identified and there is no epigraphic evidence. Some of Eukleides' works may, however, be identified on coins. His Demeter/Eileithyia is possibly represented on coins from Bura which will be discussed in the relevant section and his Zeus at Aegira is possibly also shown on coins.

⁶⁶ Pausanias, 7.26.2.

⁶⁷ Madigan, 1991,510.

The god is seated on a high backed throne, holding a figure of Nike in his outstretched right hand and a sceptre in his raised, left hand. An himation is draped over his lower body, but his chest is bare. He is heavily bearded and has long, thick hair. Other than this, nothing can be said of the figure or of Eukleides' style. The Demeter\Eileithyia shows perhaps more of his style and compares well with many Hellenistic cult images of goddesses in terms of the drapery style and the elongated proportions. This suggests a Hellenistic origin, but a more exact date is difficult to determine. Eukleides may have been a contemporary of Damophon who worked in a similar region and created several cult images for cities in the Peloponnese. This is speculative, but reasonable to assume. More will be said of Eukleides later, but a date in the second century B.C. is possible. For the rest of the century there is little evidence for cult images of Zeus and Hera, except for possible fragments of the god on Delos.

Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia on Delos.

The small Oikos dedicated to Zeus and Athena on Mount Kynthos on Delos contained several cult images and other votive statues. An inscription which refers to an inventory * made of the contents of the shrine mentions the earlier bronze cult statues of the two deities. In 119/18, however, new cult images were installed in the oikos by Dionysios, the archon of Athens during these years. Why these new cult statues were commissioned and dedicated is uncertain. Perhaps the bronze statues had been removed or destroyed. Alternatively they may have stood with the new marble images, though why this should be the case is a mystery. No trace of the bronze images remain but of the marble, late

second century statues, a colossal hand is the only remnant.⁶⁸ This hand is two times life-size, thus the images were of considerable size and may have been acrolithic, though the evidence of a hand alone is not sufficient to substantiate this. With this small amount of evidence, however, it is impossible to determine the appearance of the cult images.

A survey of cult images of Zeus and Hera has attempted to analyze the different types and styles of cult images, but this has not been easy due to the find spots of most of the pieces and their lack of context. What has been possible is to formulate the appearance of Zeus during the period and the many different styles and variations used to portray his image. Most of the cult images follow methods which were essentially modern and not eclectic or traditional. It has been proved with some support that the cult image of Zeus at Olympia by Phidias was not commonly used by sculptors as a model. For Hera the evidence is less forthcoming and it has only been possible to isolate, and then somewhat hesitantly, two images of her which have no fixed context whatsoever. Images of the two deities from the mainland and islands of Greece appear to be less frequent though this could be due to the chance of survival rather than proving that the deities were not a popular choice for sculptors during the Hellenistic period in these regions. Most of the dates fixed to the cult images are formed out of stylistic comparisons with other, loosely dated pieces and the most common analogies have been made with the Great Altar at Pergamon. This monument, as already noted, is possibly not the most appropriate choice for comparison, but at least it has a reasonably fixed date. Hera is certainly a mystery in terms of iconography but architectural and epigraphic evidence does not show a decrease in the popularity of her cult during this period. Altogether Zeus is well represented amongst the

⁶⁸ Plassart, 1928,123.

cult statue fragments of the Hellenistic period and the various images which survive expose the styles and mannerisms of many sculptors.

Surviving cult images of Poseidon and his consort Amphitrite are rare from the Archaic and Classical periods. This is not because of a lack of temples dedicated to these deities, but through the chance of survival. The god alone, and to a lesser extent with Amphitrite, was a popular choice in sculpture and several original statues and single heads of Poseidon survive from the Hellenistic period to assess the development of his iconography during this time. What is lacking is any real description of his major cult images in the literary record for any period. Poseidon's most famous Classical temple was at Sounion in Attica, but no preserved accounts describe the statue in detail and thus it is impossible to assess how influential the statue was on later representations of the god. Farnell, in his illustrious account of the cults of the Olympian gods, correctly points out that monumental evidence for the cult of Poseidon is meagre and relatively uninformative.¹ One critical problem is how to identify statues of Poseidon when his typical attributes are missing; these most commonly being the trident and dolphin. Without such distinguishing characteristics, it is often almost impossible to recognise Poseidon from other bearded father deities such as Zeus, Asklepios or even Hades. Single heads can be particularly problematic when trying to determine the deity involved. One particular misinterpretation of the personality of Poseidon, and its translation into marble or bronze statuary, is that he is expected to appear restless, slightly weather beaten and suffering from a temperamental nature. Farnell explains this point succinctly, concluding that with Poseidon's images, ".. the energy revealed is physical rather than intellectual".² It is thus expected that Poseidon

¹ Farnell, 1907, 56.

² Farnell, 1907, 68.

should be depicted as being slightly less dignified than Zeus for instance. It could be possible that because Poseidon was strongly associated with the ocean, with its violent and unpredictable nature, that the god should reflect this function in his personality and consequently in his cult images. Whether this aspect of Poseidon's nature is indicated in surviving religious images from the Hellenistic period will be interesting, as will any differences with statues of Zeus and Asklepios. As for Amphitrite, the goddess was so rarely rendered in large scale sculpture that any iconographical survey of her depends mostly on depictions on small scale reliefs or vase painting.³ Relatively more fragments of Poseidon and Amphitrite's cult images survive from the Hellenistic period than from the Classical period, but very few from the late fourth century B.C.

The Late Classical Forerunners

During the fourth century B.C., when few temples were erected to the god, there are only a handful of recorded statues of Poseidon which were carved by the late Classical masters. Praxiteles created at least one statue of the god which was later taken to Rome and could be seen in the collection of Asinius Pollio.⁴ The original does not survive and there are no copies which can be safely associated with Praxiteles' creation. Another famous group, of which Poseidon was the central figure, was also later to be seen in Rome and was the work of Skopas. This monumental assembly consisted of Poseidon, Thetis and Achilles and several ancillary figures. Again, however, there are scarcely any other descriptions of the group and the type of Poseidon formulated by Skopas is lost to us. In general there

³ See Kaempf-Dimitriadou, in LIMC I, 1981, 724-735.

⁴ For all of these statues see Pliny NH 36.33-34.

are few prototypes and for the later fourth century we must rely on one head of the god from Chios, now in Vienna.

The Chios Poseidon (catalogue number 22) figs. 69-70.

The only fragment of sculpture in the round which can be probably be identified as Poseidon and dated to the early Hellenistic period is a marble head now in Vienna. The head comes from an over life sized image, the original function and context of which is archaeologically unidentified, but it could possibly be a remnant of a cult image. The modelling and appearance of the head reveal interesting contradictions of style. The restless treatment of the hair, which hangs in deeply cut locks close to his face and the long hair reaching the lower neck, would usually indicate a date no earlier than the last quarter of the century. The facial features, however, have more in common with certain mid fourth century heads for example a head from the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos and the Mylasa Zeus.⁵ Such contradictory features in a single piece render a date difficult to come by. It is hard to determine whether the Poseidon is by a late Classical sculptor who was ahead of his time, or by an early Hellenistic sculptor who was not yet immersed in the more vigorous modelling styles employed in the heads of bearded deities.

Little has been written about the Chios head and only Horn has attempted to analyze its style and origin.⁶ He dated the head to the last quarter of the fourth century through comparisons with the later Attic grave stelai, which were carved before the Sumptuary

⁵ For the bearded Mausoleum head see Waywell, 1978, no.45 (BM 1054) and for the Mylasa Zeus see section on Zeus and Hera.

⁶ Horn, 1934,105.

Legislation of Demetrios of Phaleron in 318-7 B.C. The Poseidon is certainly Attic in character and the later fourth century was a period when sculptors were being forced, for economic reasons, to move eastwards across the Aegean to find work. That the Chios head compares well with the Mausoleum and Mylasa heads suggests a probable Attic origin of the master of the Chios head. The similarities between the Poseidon and the grave relief figures are not, however, as close as those with the aforementioned heads.⁷

Notable comparisons with the Chios and Mausoleum heads are the structure of the facial features. The precise contours of the eyelids are similar with particularly sharp lower lids, and the eyes are long, almond shape and have an elongated inner corner. The lines of the eyebrows are similarly formed and the cheekbones are distinct and merge into the fleshy bar over the outer corner of the eye. The mouths are only slightly different, the Mausoleum head having parted, instead of closed, lips. The overall arrangement and carving of the features conform to an almost identical pattern and Waywell noted the parallels between the Mylasa head of Zeus and the Mausoleum head. The Chios head is possibly by the same sculptor as the Mausoleum head, but appears slightly later in date. This is due to the handling of the hair and beard and to the surface treatment of the skin over the muscles and bone.

A closer examination of the profiles of the heads reveals that the eye on Poseidon is sunk deeply into its socket and the line of the brow is slightly raised when compared to the Mausoleum head. Thus the expression of the Poseidon is a touch more pathetic in

⁷ Horn compared the modelling of the Poseidon with the figure on the Rhamnous grave stele in the National Museum Athens, Diepolder, 1931, plate 54. The head of a man on Athens NM 2574 is also remarkably similar in style but not identical to the Chios head, see Diepolder, 1931, plate 53.

appearance, whereas the Halikarnassos head is still Classical in form. The modelling of the hair is even more Hellenistic in character. The Poseidon has the hairstyle associated with the Zeus of Otricoli, the original of which is probably best dated to the last quarter of the century or the early third. The hair has more volume than the Mausoleum head, with each lock being relatively deeply undercut and the whole agitated arrangement is completed by the visually arresting handling of the loose locks seen at the side, hanging from the band. This contrasts with the smoother rendering of the skin and compares most convincingly with the Poseidon from Pergamon, dated to the mid second century B.C., which develops this type of head of Poseidon into the Baroque style. The hair on both also has a slightly languid appearance, perhaps a subtle allusion to his function as god of the ocean. Thus it appears that the Chios Poseidon may be a work of an Attic sculptor who had observed the early innovations in the plastic arts of the time of Alexander and Lysippos. A reasonable date would be around 330 - 300 B.C.

Lawrence, in his brief account of the Chios head, compared it to early Ptolemaic heads of bearded deities, particularly one of Sarapis now in Alexandria.⁸ This latter deity, however, must be a product of a more advanced Hellenistic sculptor because of the vigorous modelling of the hair and the manner in which the skin is tense over the flesh and bone beneath, and thus the comparison is not at all convincing. The Chios Poseidon is of excellent quality and bears the mark of a first rate sculptor who was experimenting with innovations in style and technique. The result is a quiet but imposing representation of the god. The stylistic importance of the head is that it shows a transitional stage, whereby the more passive features of a late Classical model are agitated by a more elastic

⁸ Lawrence, 1927, plate 17A.

treatment of the skin over the underlying features, and by a more voluminous hairstyle. It has not yet reached the stage of intense modelling favoured by sculptors of the late third and second centuries B.C., but the seeds of the Baroque Style are evident in the head. In this respect it compares well with the contemporary Otricoli Zeus and the slightly later Asklepios from Melos. Horn would also compare the piece to the original on which the Lateran Poseidon is based; a statue by either Lysippos or one of his contemporaries.⁹

The only clue as to any possible context for the head comes from Strabo who said that there was a sanctuary to Poseidon on the island.¹⁰ This appears to have been on the coast, a natural location for a temple of the god, but its exact whereabouts are unknown. Of course a statue of Poseidon could have come from anywhere on the island and because we have no idea where the head came from, it is pointless to speculate on its original context. Where we have a good context for cult images of Poseidon and Amphitrite, remains of the statues are unfortunately fragmentary. This is certainly the case at Tenos.

The Third Century B.C.

Only one identified temple of Poseidon and Amphitrite can be unquestionably dated to the third century. This was perhaps their most significant temple from any period of Greek history, but unfortunately too little remains of the actual cult images to analyze their style and design. We must rely on coinage once again to reconstruct the visual impact of the group. For the rest of the century there are two sculptures representing the god; the first a

⁹ For recent theories about the statue see Bartman, 1992,102-146.

¹⁰ Strabo, 14.1.33 and 35.

head in New York, which is a possible Poseidon, and the other a copy of a statue of the god from Cherchel in Algeria.

The Tenos Group (catalogue number 4)

The colossal, acrolithic cult images of Poseidon and Amphitrite at Tenos were amongst the most infamous of their cult statues. They were the work of the Athenian sculptor Telesinos whose fame and wealth brought him notoriety and personal gain. An inscription found on Delos informs us that he donated statues of Asklepios and Queen Stratonike to the sanctuary and that he repaired any damaged statues on the island free of charge.¹¹ His reward was to be publicly honoured in Delian affairs, gaining a wreath and the right to buy land on the island. The sculptor is only known for his work at Delos and on Tenos, but, as an Athenian, he possibly trained in one of the schools of sculpture there and possibly under one of the late Classical masters. His reputation and wealth must have been derived from some source and it is feasible that he had made his name before the 280's when it is thought he was working on his Cycladic projects. What is frustrating is that we only have a few fragments from Tenos from which to determine his style, therefore we are restricted to these and to the portrayal of the cult images on coins. Ultimately we have to rely on the coin from Tenos to compare and contrast contemporary works and this, of course, is an inadequate method of defining the style of a particular sculptor. One scholar has doubted the third century date for the marble, acrolithic fragments, on the grounds that he believes Telesinos only worked in bronze.¹² His

¹¹ For the inscription see Marcade, 1957,II,124. IG XI,4,514. *

¹² For the views of Querell, see Etienne and Braun. 1986, 105.

arguments are not justified as the sculptor carved Queen Stratonike in marble for the Delians. What is clear is that he worked in both marble and bronze and the acrolithic statues were not carved in the second century to replace any earlier bronze images as he suggests.

That the group was celebrated in antiquity is evident both historically and geographically. The Aitolian Confederation granted the sanctuary asylum in 278 B.C. and also donated * funds towards the construction of the temple. Tenos ranked only second to Delos in its importance as a religious centre in the Cyclades and its international importance is attested in a series of decrees excavated on the island honouring individuals from many parts of * the Greek world but the analysis of these are not integral to this study. What is important is that the reputation of the cult of Poseidon and Amphitrite gained considerably by its state of asylum and from its central position in the Cycladic Confederation. The sanctuary almost became Panhellenic within this group of islands. The temple must have had regular visitors from all parts of the Aegean, and, given this reputation the cult images would have been seen by many worshippers and possibly sculptors also. Before the group is analysed, a brief resume of the sanctuary and its principal structures is required.

Archaeological excavations at Kionia on Tenos have revealed a series of temples, temple E1 being the one in which the cult images by Telesinos stood. The temple was not large in size, measuring 19.75 x 15.30 metres and consisted of a pronaos and a cella which measured 9.00 x 6.20 metres. Four Doric columns stood at the front and rear of the temple but there was no side colonnade. Like other Hellenistic sanctuaries the site was architecturally embellished with other structures. A large fountain exedra was constructed

in the later third century, a monumental altar and a second temple in the second century B.C., and a long stoa probably to be dated to the late second or first century. So the sanctuary continued in use throughout the Hellenistic period and into Roman times and was probably not abandoned until the third century A.D. How the cult images met their fate is uncertain, but the surviving parts do not show evidence of burning so may therefore have been gradually dismantled and the marble and wood used for building material over the next few centuries.

Evidence for the appearance of the two cult images comes from two sources, coinage and the few surviving marble fragments. How far the Tenos group inspired imitations or variants of their composition depends on extant fragments of other groups and on coin images. What is clear from the coins is that the two figures were standing with Poseidon on the left and Amphitrite on the right. Poseidon is draped rather in the manner of the Poseidon from Melos except that the garment folds more heavily over the Teniote god's shoulder. Amphitrite is also similar to the Melos goddess and this helps to unite this latter image with the Melos Poseidon and suggests that the sculptor of this later group possibly looked at the Tenos group for a model. The Amphitrite from Tenos compares well with other early third century goddesses, namely the Persephone from Kallipolis and the Themis of Rhamnous. The high girdled chiton is popular throughout the Hellenistic period but the roots of this drapery design go back to the mid fourth century with statues and female figures on reliefs. More will be said on this matter later.

The head of Poseidon was included on many coins of the Teniotes, yet another manifestation of the importance of the cult statues. The features of the god, however,

vary from coin to coin and this confuses any attempt to distinguish the most accurate reproduction of the cult image. The extant fragment of the head, consisting of the nose, upper lip and left cheek does not help us other than demonstrating that the sculptor treated the fleshy surfaces in a rather vigorous manner. The cheekbone is well defined and the nose is outlined by a shallow depression which merges with the fleshy areas of the cheek. The fragments of fingers show a careful modelling style with the nails precisely delineated. Other than this, nothing can be said of the style of the statue. The coins from Tenos, however, show a head of Poseidon that appears rather dynamically modelled, with a full head of hair, thick beard and powerfully rendered facial features.

The importance of the group is that they show a continuing popularity of the acrolithic technique in the production of large-scale cult images. Telesinos must have been adept in constructing colossal statuary which requires an understanding of engineering and a proficiency in concealing joints between the marble and wooden parts. Many of the larger cult images from the Hellenistic period utilised this technique in their construction, namely the Aegira Dionysos, the Athena from Priene, the Pheneos group and some of Damophon's cult images. Another important element of the cult group of Telesinos is the design of the figures and the composition. At Tenos the figures of Poseidon and Amphitrite are united by their function as sea deities, their poses and the gesturing of turning towards each other. We shall see this imitated, though less successfully, at Melos over a century later. Amphitrite raises her right hand and holds the prow of a ship and a sceptre in her left, and Poseidon holds his trident, which has a dolphin coiled around its lower end, in his right, raised hand. The two figures balance each other, framing the composition with their sceptre and trident (figs.115-116).

The display of the cult images is also an important consideration. At Tenos the cella of the temple was small, and to accommodate two such colossal standing images would have been a tight squeeze. No trace of the base, on which they were positioned, survives and thus it is impossible to conjecture the original height of the heads of the figures above the worshipper, but in such a small room it would have been difficult to stand at an angle where you could observe the facial features. The room would have also been dimly lit and so details of the figures would have disappeared in the gloom. As the only known temple excavated for the cult of Poseidon and Amphitrite the Tenos temple and fragments of cult images are informative, but only in terms of how they can be restored and of their technique rather than being useful stylistic models. We are at a loss to find temples to the deities in Asia Minor where most of our late third and second century examples of cult images tend to have been located. That the cult images at Tenos were the most celebrated statues of the god and goddess from the Hellenistic period is undoubted, but how far they influenced later cult statues of the deities is made almost impossible by the lack of excavated temples and sculptures of the gods.

Two third century images of Poseidon (catalogue numbers 23 and 36), figs. 71-72 and 106-107.

Rarely mentioned in text books is a large head which has no known provenance and is not universally identified as a Poseidon. Ridgway identifies the head as a Zeus, but gives no indication why.¹³ Richter claimed that the head resembles the Poseidon of Melos but

¹³ Ridgway, 1990, 250.

dates the New York head to the early third century.¹⁴ Thus the brief discussions of the piece have failed to assess the fragment effectively and so a detailed evaluation of the head is warranted.

Stewart correctly refers to the head as Attic in style with its regularly cut features, an opaque modelling of the flesh surfaces and the contrast of textures between the hair and the skin.¹⁵ If this early date proposed by Stewart is accurate, then the Poseidon would be contemporary with works such as the Chios Poseidon and the Otricoli Zeus which appear to be Attic creations. A comparison of these heads, however, reveals obvious contrasts. The Chios Poseidon and the Zeus still owe more to the art of Praxiteles in the rendering of the facial features and particularly the shape of the eyes which are long with slightly closing lids. Their lower eyelids merge with little undulation into the upper cheek and the whole expression is serene and mellow. The eyes of the New York head are larger with fleshier, heavier lids generating a more intense expression. Another significant contrast is the manner in which the contour of the eyebrows form a broader curve than on the other two heads, where the line of the brow is flatter. The Poseidon also retains a fleshier bulge over the outer corner of the eye. Even more dissimilar is the structure of the face with its distinct bone and flesh surfaces. The surface undulates far more than on the other two heads, having been carved by a sculptor who was under the influence of a restless and more vigorous modelling style. The Poseidon has not reached the intensity of expression and exaggeration of forms typified by the sculptors who followed the Baroque movement in the later third and second centuries B.C., but it is convincingly different enough from

¹⁴ Richter, 1954, 90.

¹⁵ Stewart, 1979, 6.

the earlier Attic heads to be cited as a later creation. Early Hellenistic sculptors moved eastward and were employed by patrons in the eastern Aegean and Asia Minor, Phryomachos being the prime example. The New York head could be an intermediate work by such a sculptor who still retained Attic reserve but absorbed a more dynamic form of modelling into his style. In this respect one of the most obvious parallels is the head of Demeter in Boston, also given an earlier date by most scholars, but revealing similar tendencies to the Poseidon.

The New York Poseidon is best dated to the mid third century B.C. at a time when the Baroque style was taking hold, but may have originally been a work which stood on the Greek mainland or one of the islands, though a location in Asia Minor is not out of the question. This brings Stewart's comparison with the head on the Macedonian coin to mind.¹⁶ In profile the two heads retain a similar modelling of the hair and beard. The hair on the marble head is rather roughly sketched out in thick, dishevelled locks which spread almost horizontally over the brow leaving the temples clear. The hair on the Macedonian Poseidon is slightly more regular in its arrangement but this could be due to the die cutter simplifying the design. The facial features of the coin image also appear blander in comparison and reveal a weaker, less vital execution of the fleshy surfaces. Thus the New York head retains the characteristic and traditional frontality of a typical cult image, with the eyes looking directly ahead and not at the worshipper, but displays the contemporary styles and mannerisms.

¹⁶ Stewart, 1979,6, plate 29.

Perhaps the closest stylistic comparison with the New York head is the Cherchel Poseidon. This large copy, found in the bath complex at Cherchel preserves a similar facial construction to the New York head, but a much more elaborate hairstyle. The statue combines a rather static pose with a vigorous modelling of the hair and facial features and a powerful physique. The statue appears to reproduce an image of Poseidon dated to the latter half of the third century B.C. and was perhaps by an Athenian sculptor, as several of its characteristics indicate a possible Attic-trained master. Like the creator of the New York head, however, he was influenced by the Baroque style. The heavy musculature of the Poseidon is evidently Baroque in character and reveals that the statue is not a Roman creation built on eclectic formulae as suggested by Manderscheid.¹⁷ The extravagant effects of the style have, however, been moderated perhaps by the traditional restraint of its Athenian master and by the conservatism adopted when representing deities.

The head compares most favourably with early Hellenistic bearded deities, but like the New York head, the taut, elastic quality of the skin over the flesh and bone show that it dates to the mid Hellenistic period, somewhere between 250 and 225 B.C. For the type of hair the Asklepios of Melos is the most conspicuous counterpart. The locks are brushed back high over the forehead, then sweep upwards and fan out over the crown being pushed forward again by the restricting band around the head. Each lock is isolated by the use of a deep drill and the hair appears layered which gives it volume and life. The beards are rendered in a similar fashion, only on the Asklepios the locks appear softer and less rigidly composed due to it being an original Greek work and not a copy. The facial features also compare favourably with the large, long eyes under a heavy, furrowed brow

¹⁷ Manderscheid, 1981, catalogue number 502.

creating a quite sensitive expression. The large nose and slightly opened lips are also features of both heads.

The muscular physique of the Poseidon and its proportions are clearly Hellenistic in character. The right, preserved leg appears elongated and there is a torsion of the head and body to the right and the legs to the left. This gives the body a rhythmic swing which adds vitality to the otherwise static posture. This characteristic could not be expected before the time of Lysippos and the whole statue may have been inspired by a Lysippean prototype and modified to accommodate the heavier modelling of the later third century. A closer dating can be derived from comparisons with the Ludovisi Gaul, a copy of a group created in Pergamon during the decade 230 - 220 B.C.¹⁸ The heavy musculature is similar and also the broad shoulders which create a stocky rendition of the male physique. The modelling of the pectorals is flatter than in later Pergamene works. The muscles on the abdomen and flanks are heavily contoured; the bronze originals of both the Gaul and Poseidon would have softened this effect and made these muscles appear less pronounced. The legs of the Gaul are similarly elongated and tightly muscled. Given the inherent difficulties which arise when comparing copies one should not push similarities too far, particularly when attempting to determine the date of the original. Taking all things into consideration, however, the original of the Charchel Poseidon cannot be denied Hellenistic status. The broadness of the torso can be compared with another late third century work, the so-called Barberini satyr, either a Hellenistic original or a fine quality copy.¹⁹ Later Pergamene creations, such as the gods on the Great Altar and the torso of a

¹⁸ See Ridgway, 1990, chapter 8 for a detailed discussion of the Gauls from Pergamon.

¹⁹ For an examination of this statue see Ridgway, 1990, 313-318.

Hellenistic ruler from that city have a more rounded, narrower physique with a heavy definition of all the muscles.²⁰ Thus the Cherchel Poseidon is probably to be dated to the period 230 - 220 B.C showing a slight development from the Melian Asklepios and the New York head in terms of the dynamic treatment of the carving.

As for the function and original context of the prototype of the Cherchel statue, it could well have been a cult image, but its original location is unknown. Its relationship with Pergamene works suggests a context in Asia Minor, but no excavated or recorded temples seem to have been built for Poseidon in that region though his cult is attested at various sites. The appearance of the figure suggests a cult image, particularly the gesture of holding out his right hand, a method of bringing worshipper and deity together, or alternatively a gesture of piety. The statue carries the usual iconographic details of the god, namely the trident and dolphin and is a fine copy of an important original of the mid Hellenistic period.

²⁰ For references to the Gods on the Gigantomachy see the last chapter and for the Hellenistic ruler statue see Smith, 1991, fig.181.

The Second Century

Sculptural evidence becomes even more scarce in this period and there is only evidence for one group of cult images, that from Melos, which unfortunately has a rather ambiguous context.

The Melos Group (catalogue number 24), figs. 73-81.

Most of the preserved cult images in this study are to be dated to the second century B.C. but for Poseidon and Amphitrite the picture is surprisingly bleak. Only one group of cult images survive from this period and even then they have no fixed context and their function as cult images is only indicated by their appearance. These were found at Klima on Melos towards the end of the last century along with another smaller female statue possibly representing Aphrodite.²¹ The two large statues represent Poseidon, and possibly Amphitrite, but their original location is uncertain. There is evidence for a sanctuary of Poseidon on the island, attested by the discovery of a statue and its base, the inscription on which states that it was dedicated to the god. This by no means confirms * that the statues found at Klima are cult images from a temple, but an analysis of their type and appearance may help to substantiate their function and date. Even more important is the question whether the statues belong together and if, in fact, the female statue represents Amphitrite at all. When the Melos statues were first published in 1889 by Collignon, the Amphitrite was considered by him of mediocre quality and not part of the

²¹ This small statue, 1.10m is described in Karouzou, 1968, Athens National Museum no 238.

group with the Poseidon.²² All too often the statue of the goddess is neglected in text books and the statues have not been analyzed as a group. Etienne and Braun discuss the statues as a pair but only in their relationship with the Tenos cult group which certainly influenced the design of the Melos cult images.²³ The island of Melos is not far from Tenos and the creator of these images must have been aware of the celebrated group by Telesinos. The dilemma of grouping statues together is an interesting issue and thus before the statues are examined individually, an attempt will be made to unite the statues into a group.

The Melos statues are united by several factors, not merely by their common link with the Tenos pair but also stylistically. One of the most convincing clues as to their joint function is their similarity to a group of images depicted on a coin from Pontos. The coin dates to the reign of Mithradates IV, between 169-150 B.C., and carries two standing images of Zeus and Hera on its reverse.²⁴ The Zeus stands to the left of the Hera in an almost identical pose to the Poseidon from Melos. The weight is supported on his standing, right leg whilst the left swings backwards in a step to the side. The right arm is elevated considerably and carries a sceptre while his left arm secures the drapery around his hips. The torso is modelled in a similar manner to the Melos statue with a slim but firm musculature and elongated proportions. The only difference is that the himation on the Zeus on the coin covers his left shoulder and flank rather like the statue of Zeus from Pergamon so the material does not form a small bundle of folds over his left shoulder as on the Poseidon. Also different is the turn of the head to his right. This is due to the

²² Collignon, 1889, 502. The author does not even identify the female statue as Poseidon's consort.

²³ See earlier section on the Tenos cult group for references and comparison with Melos group.

²⁴ For this coin see Regling, 1924, plate XLII no.854.

switching of positions of male and female statue, the Melos pair having stood on the reverse sides to the Tenos pair. The Amphitrite from Melos compares well with the Hera on the coin in her general posture and drapery design as both carry their weight on their left legs, like their male companions with the other leg relaxed. The Hera on the coin raises her arm slightly higher than the Melian statue and carries a sceptre, whereas the Melos statue possibly carried a ship's prow in this hand like the Amphitrite from Tenos and thus the hand did not need to be raised so high. The garments worn by the Hera on the coin are not clearly visible but she appears to wear a high girdled chiton which is fitted tightly over the breasts, waist and stomach. There are also faint indications of a coil of material around the hips but there is little sign of the lower hem of the himation. The excess of material on the left side of the two figures is also comparable. The obvious difference between the two groups are the positioning of the male and female deity. On the coin the figures move towards each other; an action indicated and enhanced by the outer legs which are relaxed and seem to push forwards. The marble statues, however, appear to swing away from each other, forming a "V" shaped design. It is feasible that the Poseidon stood on the other side of Amphitrite, as on the coin, but then their heads would have turned away from each other. This restoration of the group appears clumsier than positioning the statues in the proposed way. The reconstruction in figure 73, conveys perhaps the most visually satisfying arrangement of the group.

The statues from Melos also compare in their poses, execution and drapery design. In terms of posture the upper torsoes are frontal, but the heads turn one way and the lower bodies in the other direction moved by the swing of the leg. The overall balance of the group, however, is not as successful as it could have been, particularly with the

Amphitrite's raised right arm which mars the composition slightly but not sufficiently enough to divorce her from the group. Even more convincing are the proportions of the bodily forms. The figures both follow Lysippean measurements with their elongated torsoes, long legs and, on the Poseidon, a small head in relation to the length of the body. The heights of the figures are also not discordant; the Amphitrite being approximately 0.30 metres shorter than the Poseidon if her head is restored. Again this balances well with the slight discrepancy between male and female figures at Tenos and on the coin from Pontos. Even more convincingly similar is the design of the himation on both statues. The tightly fitting material almost acts as a sheath over the hips and down to just below the knees. This material outlines the legs more clearly on the right side of Amphitrite and on Poseidon's left. The weight bearing legs on each figure are, in contrast, hardly revealed through the material. On the left side of each figure, behind the leg, is a volume of excess material which is rendered comparably on each figure. The material hangs in flat layers with zig-zagging pleats which are rendered far more successfully on the Poseidon than on the Amphitrite, suggesting a more competent craftsman was at work on this figure. The most prominent feature in the drapery of both figures is the coil of material which forms the upper edge of the himation. The pleats of material are textured and carved almost identically, but again on the Poseidon these are executed in a more effective and naturalistic manner. This feature of the Amphitrite is rendered with flatter, tighter pleats when seen from the front. At the side of this figure, where the visual impact of the statue's design improves dramatically, the coil creates an effective device which adds volume to the figure and gives the statue a cylindrical shape. From a frontal viewpoint the Amphitrite appears dull and flat in design. The effect of the coil, particularly on the Poseidon, but to a lesser extent on his companion, emphasizes the

twist of the figures and this material acts as a solid contrast between the smoother planes of the god's naked torso and the goddess's crumpled chiton.

A final comparison with some of the figures on the frieze from the temple of Hekate at Lagina, which appear to be the last examples of the types of these two statues that survive, also provides evidence that the pose and drapery used for the goddess has contemporary parallels with that used for Poseidon. The figure of a woman from the east side, slab VII has a high girdled chiton and tightly bound himation. There is also a twist of drapery around her hips and over her left arm.²⁵ The action of Amphitrite's chiton leaving the shoulders bare is paralleled in the figure of a goddess attacking a giant on the west slab 1. The material of the garment is rendered in a softer, more transparent manner at Lagina but is similar nonetheless.²⁶ The Poseidon has a parallel figure on a slab from the north side of the temple frieze. The pose is identical and the positioning of the drapery on the left shoulder is also comparable. The only difference is the length of the himation, which, on the relief figure, is much shorter. The frieze from Lagina was probably carved somewhere in the last quarter of the second century B.C., but for this period, when there is a general decline in quality, the execution of the frieze is fresh, imaginative and of a high standard. This temple frieze plausibly marks the lower date for the Melos statues.

Given these convincing similarities between the two statues in both design and posture they must have been grouped together. The fact that they were discovered together

²⁵ For this figure see Schober, 1933,29,no.4 and plate III.

²⁶ Schober, 1933,41,no.2 and plate XVIII

suggests that they originally stood in a similar location, in this case almost certainly a temple. The next important consideration concerns the date of the group and, due to the lack of any archaeological context, one must rely on comparisons with other works to demonstrate that their styles are chronologically compatible and stylistically harmonious.

The Poseidon

The large statue of the god has been frequently illustrated and discussed in textbooks and analyzed in detail by Schafer.²⁷ Generally it is described as a late Hellenistic adaptation of an earlier, late Classical/early Hellenistic prototype. The label most commonly attached to the style of the statue is classicising, and yet the authors cannot agree amongst themselves as to the original prototype, nor do they discuss parallel pieces from the Classical period.²⁸ Carpenter referred to the statue as Classical in principle with Hellenistic drapery. Dickens called it an eclectic work derived from Lysippean models and with a Rhodian modelling style. Robertson labelled it a Classicising piece following an early Hellenistic model with a Polykleitan body. Only recently have scholars begun to admit that the design of the figure and its modelling style are thoroughly Hellenistic in character. Smith claims that the sculptor did not attempt to recreate the Classical style and this is realised in the naturalistic drapery and the modern style of the head.²⁹ The Poseidon may have had an early Hellenistic model and it has already been noted that the statue was probably influenced by the statue of the god at Tenos in its general posture and appearance. There is, however, a vigorous treatment of the head and body which reveals

²⁷ Schafer, 1968.

²⁸ Carpenter, 1960,212; Dickens, 1971 (reprint), 63; Robertson, 1975,554.

²⁹ Smith, 1993,189-90.

that the sculptor elaborated upon the type and created a thoroughly high Hellenistic image of the god. The most obvious parallels are, with the exception of the Tenos god, dated to the second century B.C.

Schafer noted a similar statue depicted on a coin of Bactria.³⁰ The god is shown on the reverse of the coin in much the same manner as the Melos statue. The weight is carried on the right leg whilst the left swings to the side and backwards slightly. The right arm is raised and holds a trident and the left secures the himation around his hips. The head is turned slightly to his left and the modelling of the facial features and hair are extremely similar. The head is narrow and elongated with a high, narrow forehead. The beard is full and the short hair is swept over the brow. Similar also is the twist in the posture and the pronounced contrapposto which forces the right flank to the side, distorting the figure somewhat. The modelling of the torsoes of both the marble statue and the coin image shows a similar style and technique. The upper body is elongated and the musculature is strong but not over-stressed. The Baktrian Poseidon wears a similarly draped himation with a large coil of material clustered around his hips and the die cutter has stressed the sharp, oblique folds across the legs which are a prominent feature of the Melos statue. The main difference is that the himation on the coin figure covers his left side rather like the Pergamene and Smyrna statues of Zeus. The other difference is that the Poseidon on the Baktrian coin carries a large palm branch in his left hand. Schafer believes that this is an addition by the die cutter and admittedly this would have been an unwieldy appendage if carved in marble.³¹ This could of course have been added in bronze and there is no

³⁰ Schafer, 1968,60, fig.20.

³¹ Schafer, 1968,60.

reason to deny the statue this attribute; it does not impair the composition. The importance of the coin demonstrates that this type of stock body was a popular choice for images of Poseidon and for Zeus. Furthermore the type was frequently employed over a wide geographical area.³² Vermeule stresses the significance of the Melos statue but claims that it was this particular image which provoked later cult images of deities of this type.³³ That the Melos statue was not the innovator is shown by the Tenos group and the similar Bithynia Zeus discussed in the section concerning Zeus and Hera. A common feature of all these statues is the exaggerated torsion and their open composition. The drapery is animated by the accentuated movement of the legs and creates a powerfully visual composition; the Melos statue is energetic and restless in its stance. Compared to the statue of Zeus from Pergamon, which belongs to a contemporary evolutionary phase, the rendering of the male physique is much weakened in the Melos image. This is not due to any great distance in time between the two statues but rather a different location; the sculptors at Pergamon favoured a stronger, more robust rendition of the male nude.

Given these many earlier and later variations of the type it is difficult to locate a date for the piece. The Tenos statue probably initiated the type, but it is important to emphasize the innovative aspects of the Melos statue. The first significant factor is that the statue has a Hellenistic bearing, the torsion and wide step of the figure having no conspicuous Classical parallels. The proportions of the figure follow Lysippean canons of proportion but the modelling of the torso is not easily paralleled amongst copies of the sculptor's

³² Baktrian coins show a variety of different images of this type with a comparable torsion of the body, a similar open composition, drapery style and facial features. Two examples are a Zeus on a coin of King Heliokles (150 -130 B.C.), and another Zeus on a coin dated to the reign of King Archebius of 120 B.C. Kraay, 1966, nos.779 & 780.

³³ Vermeule, 1980,84.

works. Schafer observed a similarity between the Poseidon and a headless statue found on Kos.³⁴ The position of this statue is reversed with the weight bearing leg on the left. The himation is only superficially similar in design, having a corresponding coil of material around the hips, but the garment conceals more of the side and back of the figure than on the Melos statue. The execution of the drapery reveals its Roman date with harsher, rigidly cut pleats and a simplified design. The figure is also more languid in pose and has a form corresponding more to the closed form rather than open. The figure leans forward slightly and the result is that the flesh is heavier and softer around the stomach and pectoral muscles. The identification is uncertain, though probably not Poseidon, and does not compare well with the Melos cult image.

Another example of the type of body used for the Melos cult image is found on a grave relief from Athens.³⁵ This reveals how the type of body was extended for representations of mortal beings and also broadens the geographical area in which this type of body was used even further. The raising of the arm could have been considered an heroic pose; the composition certainly conveys confidence and triumph and was later used for Hellenistic portraits of kings and Roman dignitaries.³⁶ The examples Schafer illustrates only vaguely help us to determine the style of the Poseidon. One particularly distinctive feature of the modelling is the hard and bony treatment of the facial features. This handling of the fleshy surfaces is best compared with a head of Asklepios found at Trikala.³⁷ An obvious similarity is the shape of the face, with its high, narrow forehead

³⁴ See Kabus Priesshofen, 1989,193-4, catalogue number 22, plate 33.

³⁵ Illustrated in Schafer, 1968, fig 19.

³⁶ See the Hellenistic ruler in the Terme, Himmelmann, 1989,126-49.

³⁷ See A Delt, 1961-2,171, plate 189b.

and somewhat swollen cheekbones. The shape of the widely opened eyes are similar with long eyelids. The lips are definitely alike with a short and pouting lower lip which is rendered in a rather unusual and unsatisfactory manner. The beards are also similar with thick heavily undercut locks, treated in a fluid manner, creating a surface which appears soapy in texture. The striking difference between the two heads is the difference in angle. The Asklepios bows his head down, identifying him as the more compassionate personality, a feature common in representations of the god. Poseidon's face is paternal and mild but the angle of the head hardens the features and there is no visual contact with the worshipper. The Asklepios was given a third century date by its publisher, perhaps because of its almost Praxitelean sensitivity and the tilt of the head, but stylistically it should be contemporary with the Poseidon, around the middle of the next century.

A further clue as to the date of the Melos cult image is that the sculptor was aware of the Baroque style and probably of Pergamene works but that he moderated the excesses of the style. The musculature is not third century in its treatment. The physique is more rounded than the Cherchel Poseidon and yet flatter than the male physiques on the Gigantomachy from Pergamon. The Poseidon must date to a period when the Baroque style was ending, but not exhausted. The Poseidon represents a man slightly past his prime, as emphasized by the slight spreading around the hips. The arms are surprisingly lean, but any strength and power manifests itself in the theatrical and confident pose. There is no weakening of forms, as Schafer suggests, just a modification of the almost overstated forms of the earlier second century. If the statue had been dated to the late fourth century it would be considered a fine example of heroic nudity at its peak; a typical Lysippean athlete. Other traces of the Baroque style still linger in this work, particularly

in the treatment of the drapery. The material rests in complex and heavy folds, which spread diagonally across the legs. At his left side the layers of folds are un-Classical in design with each stratum of material given volume by the deep cutting of the marble. The overall design is precarious with the garment threatening to slip at any moment, particularly over the left shoulder, but this adds life to the figure.³⁸

The original visual impact of the statue, in its temple, is hard to assess. The statue was probably positioned frontally, like the Amphitrite, but the most agreeable angle of viewing is from a quarter position to the left. From this position the structure of the face appears less angular, the modelling of the torso becomes fuller and more rounded and the smooth flesh of the abdomen and strong left hand contrast effectively with the deep, textured folds of the himation. The Amphitrite also improves when viewed from her inner, right side.

The style of the Poseidon has been touched upon already in the section concerning the Pergamene Zeus and grouped together with other similarly composed cult images. This has been reinforced by the figures found on coins of the second century B.C. which follow a similar pattern. The most secure date for the Melos group is around the middle years of the second century B.C. The style of the Poseidon combines Lysippean proportions, early Hellenistic forms, a Baroque surface treatment, but above all the characteristics of an individual and imaginative sculptor. What will be interesting to determine is whether the Amphitrite follows similar criteria and whether the type of body used was as popular a choice for female deities as the type selected for Poseidon.

³⁸ Bieber, 1961,61, commented on this feature and found it unsatisfactory.

The Amphitrite

A study of the statue of Poseidon's consort Amphitrite produces an interesting discussion concerning the garments worn by goddesses as opposed to those adorning mortal women. The Melos statue is perhaps to be identified as a goddess, rather than a portrait of a woman by her drapery and posture. There is a case to be argued that when drapery formulae were created for portraits of women there was a convention of selecting the more voluminous and restrictive garments. This attire possibly reproduced the actual fashions of the day which, in the Hellenistic period, often consisted of a thick, perhaps woollen, dress covered with a cloak of silk or fine linen. Often the hands of the woman are screened within the cloak in the so-called *pudicitia* gesture and the head was frequently veiled. The women discovered at Magnesia on the Maeander, dated to the first century B.C. provide a fine series of portraits executed in this manner.³⁹ The Delos Kleopatra is an earlier example of the use of the restrictive drapery arrangement.⁴⁰

Another possible source of evidence for the types of drapery utilised for portraits are the terracotta statuettes found in abundance at Tanagra in Boeotia and Myrina in Asia Minor. These small and intricately modelled figures probably reflected the drapery trends and postures of large scale sculpture. The Tanagras date from between 330 - 200 B.C. and the Myrina group continues down into the Roman period, but an accurate date within this period is rendered difficult due to the many styles they reflect. These may be representations of actual mortal women or generic female types and, as such, can be used

³⁹ For a discussion on these statues see Linfert, 1976, 30-31 and Pinkwart, 1973, 149-160 and plates 49-66.

⁴⁰ For this statue see Marcade, 1969, plate LXVI.

to identify the garments in fashion for women rather than goddesses.⁴¹ Goddesses on the whole wear simpler garments and reflect a more traditional approach to drapery.⁴² Many female deities from the Hellenistic period retain this uncomplicated design of a high girdled chiton with an himation draped around the hips, examples being the Persephone from Kallipolis, the Themis from Rhamnous, Amphitrite on the Tenos coin, Demeter from Pergamon, Demeter/Eileithuia from Boura and Persephone from Kyzikos.

That the Amphitrite is to be dated to about 150 B.C. is indicated by the style of the Poseidon statue, but even more convincing are the parallels with other cult images of the period. We have already noted her similarity with the Hera on the coin from Pontos. Another similar cult image represented on coinage only is the Demeter/Eileithuia from Boura. This statue was the work of Eukleides, but the dates of this sculptor are uncertain. Stewart notes that Eukleides favoured the slim, elongated proportions and high girdled chiton created in the later fourth century B.C. which continued well into the first half of the third century as we have seen.⁴³ The Boura cult image and the Amphitrite compare extremely well. Their proportions are comparable with the left leg bears the weight whilst the right is relaxed and pushes through the material of the himation. The right arms are raised, more so on Eukleides' statue and the left arm is covered with the coil of the upper

⁴¹ A typical example of these early Hellenistic figures are illustrated in Higgins, 1986, fig.145 and Kleiner, 1942, plate 5, 1-4. Close to the Amphitrite is the British Museum figure, 1875.10-12.10 (Terracotta C304). This figure is dated to the period 300 - 275 by Higgins. Later figures from Myrina have a more complicated drapery arrangement including the rope-like folds around the hips, for example the Muse (?) in Boston illustrated in Burr, 1934,72, no.103, plate 39.

⁴² The exceptions may be the Large and Small Herculaneum women, who have been considered Demeter and Persephone. These statues have the Restrictive drapery and follow, the prototype of the so-called Puditia type. For more on these female portraits see Bieber, 1977, plates 102-3. For the Herculaneum women see Bieber chapter 12.

⁴³ The large torso of "Demokratia" found in the Athenian Agora is perhaps one of the earliest examples of this type of drapery arrangement. See Palagia, 1982.

the upper himation, though on Amphitrite the arm is placed closer to the body. The heads also turn in a similar direction, to their right; the neck muscles of the Melos statue indicate this movement. In terms of drapery the two statues also correspond favourably. They wear a high girdled chiton which is fitted tightly over the small breasts, waist and stomach and the himation follows a similar pattern with the coil of material being a prominent feature. Altogether Eukleides' work is a somewhat more animated image but the Amphitrite is almost identical in most respects.

Another comparable piece is the Persephone from Kyzikos, whose drapery is executed in a similar manner to the Amphitrite. There is a certain dryness in the modelling of the garments with the tightly clinging chiton, rendered with large, flat pleats which do not reveal any signs of the flesh beneath. The material is thin, but not diaphanous. These two late pieces lack the fluidity of line and form which demonstrates that a sculptor of lesser ability was at work here. Nonetheless the Kyzikos and Melos statues have a certain lightness and elegance about them and some attempt at contrast between chiton and himation texture. The Persephone is a more successful work and the material of the himation hangs in a more naturalistic manner: in fact compared to this statue and the Boura cult image the Amphitrite is relatively lifeless and dull in execution.

Thus the Melos statues combine to make an impressive cult group, the Amphitrite being relatively inferior in quality to the Poseidon, but neither of them by a sculptor of first rate skill. What is important is that we have preserved our only male and female group which follow one of the most popular types utilised for cult images all over the Hellenistic world. The evidence from coinage can only inform us of the popularity of these models,

perhaps inspired by the Tenos group in the early third century B.C. The Melos marble group conveys the appearance of the statues and indicates how male and female divinities stood together in a group in a temple setting. Apart from these examples there is little evidence from the rest of the Hellenistic period and the Melos group may have been the last great cult images of the deities in this period.⁴⁴ There is certainly a lack of temples dedicated to the gods and particularly frustrating is the shortage of evidence from Asia Minor other than on coinage. An important and interesting conclusion is that the types of statues used for husband and wife deities, such as Poseidon and Amphitrite, could also be modified to represent Zeus and Hera and possibly royal couples, though the evidence for this is less forthcoming.

⁴⁴ The fragments of the cult images at Isthmia of a standing Poseidon and seated Amphitrite are Roman in date; the extant fragment of the Amphitrite has little in common with the Melos statue. For these see Sturgeon, 1987, 76-99, plates 33-34.

The cult images of Demeter and Kore provide one of the most interesting, yet problematic iconographical studies of the Olympian deities. Statues of these two goddesses are amongst the most numerous in the catalogue and require a systematic and stylistic analysis. Little work, however, has been attempted on the iconography of Demeter and Kore which may be because their statues are often difficult to identify amongst the numerous figures of draped, female deities, portrait statues of women and of Hellenistic queens.¹ A vast number of detached heads and draped bodies survives from all over Greece and Asia Minor, which could possibly represent either goddess, but without their distinguishing attributes, such as sheaves of corn, pomegranates, poppies or torches, we are at a loss to isolate their images. In certain cases in the catalogue, for instance the Boston Demeter, comparison with the few known Demeter types, and the elimination of goddesses which the sculptures could not represent, has perhaps identified Demeter amongst the range of female Hellenistic statues. In other cases the findspot of a statue in a sanctuary to either Demeter or Kore may again imply that a portrayal of one of the two goddesses survives. All this is very tentative, but it is fortunate that enough definitely identifiable statues of the two goddesses remain to reconstruct styles and the types used in their cult images.

Pausanias is an excellent source of material, as he seems to have had a predilection for mentioning statues and sanctuaries of the two deities. His numerous descriptions are,

¹ The finest example of this problem is the bronze statue of a female now in Izmir. Whether this is a statue of Demeter, another goddess or a portrait of a queen is discussed in Ridgway, 1967,329-334 and by Smith, 1991,83.

however, brief as his own initiation into the Eleusinian rites prevents him from revealing too much. Yet Pausanias' bias towards the deities assists us in determining where the cults and cult images of mother and daughter coincided and describes the images in unusual detail. Finally, despite the many temples erected and dedicated to the goddesses during the Archaic and Classical periods, there are few surviving cult statues or copies with which to compare the Hellenistic examples. The only significant pieces are a fragment of an Archaic cult figure from Demeter's sanctuary close to Tegea, a Roman copy of a Classical Demeter in Copenhagen and the Demeter from Knidos now in London.² For Kore the picture is less revealing and the only original statue may be that found at Khalkis.³ Another useful source are the statuettes found in their sanctuary at Kypiarissi on Kos which range in date from the late fourth to the early third centuries. The greatest and most renowned of Classical cult images of Demeter and Kore were located in their sanctuary at Eleusis, but we can perhaps expect these statues to have exerted no influence on later images as they would have been inaccessible to copyists. Furthermore, those who had seen the sacred cult statues would have violated the Mysteries if they had reported what they had witnessed; the images of the goddesses would have been a well kept secret.⁴ Thus it is necessary to rely on those cult images which survive from the Hellenistic period, descriptions in literature and representations on coins.

² Pausanias mentions the statue of Demeter in a sanctuary on the road from Tegea to Argos and the same figure was found in situ. See Bernard, 1890,382-4, plate XI. For the Copenhagen Demeter see Beschi, 1988, no.143. For the Knidian statue see Ashmole, 1951(1), 13-28.

³ See Konstantinou, 1953, 3-40.

⁴ For a discussion of possible copies see Kern, 1892,125-142. Mylonas also attempts to discover the cult images using representations on reliefs found at Eleusis, 1961, 188-9.

The Late Classical Forerunners

There are few recorded late Classical sculptures of Demeter and Kore by the great master sculptors, and equally little remains of any original statuary representing the two goddesses from this period. Only Praxiteles is recorded as having carved two cult groups of the Eleusinian deities, one, including Iakchos, in the temple of Demeter in Athens, and the other which was taken to Rome in later years.⁵ The most famous late Classical Demeter is that found at Knidos, a sculpture associated with Leochares through a process of careful stylistic comparisons.⁶ This particular cult image will be referred to throughout this section, but unfortunately dates a little too early to merit a detailed examination in this particular study. Any attempts to lower the date of the Knidian Demeter have not found widespread popularity.⁷ The importance of this statue is its influence on early Hellenistic representations of Demeter and this may become apparent throughout the chapter. From the start of the Hellenistic period, the cult of the Eleusinian goddesses spread throughout the Hellenistic world, with new temples being incorporated into the plans of cities in Macedonia, the islands, and above all, Asia Minor. However, there is also evidence for the flourishing of the cult in mainland Greece and there is a surprisingly high number of fragments from the cult images.

⁵ See Stewart, 1990,278, nos.24&25.

⁶ Ashmole, 1951, 13-28.

⁷ This downdating was due to the excessive and un-Classical bunching of drapery folds in Demeter's himation and to the so-called deliberate archaistic frontality, which is in fact a fallacy. Carpenter, 1960,213-4 and Havelock, 1981,35-6,138-9, advocated the theory but since then most scholars have rejected the date in the late Hellenistic period.

The Early Hellenistic period

There are several important original cult images from the late fourth to the early third century B.C. which survive and there is also evidence for three temples constructed in the late fourth century. At the first, a small rural sanctuary at Akraiphnion in Boeotia, excavations have produced no evidence for the cult statues, at the second, at Dion, the picture is more rewarding, and thirdly there is some evidence for the cult images of the goddesses on Delos.

The cult images in the Thesmophorion on Delos

Epigraphical sources are the only surviving evidence for the cult images of Demeter and Kore on Delos. Their sanctuary is not well preserved but most of the shrine seems to have been built around the turn of the fourth to third centuries. The most illuminating evidence for the cult statues is to be found in a long inscription, which is, in effect, an * inventory of shrines on the island.⁸ This inscription mentions cult images of the * goddesses, though is not precise about their exact location, but informs us that they were acrolithic, seated on thrones and wore crowns. An interesting feature is that they wore separately made earrings, which brings to mind the contemporary statue of Aphrodite outlined below. Furthermore, it seems that the statues were draped with purple garments, either painted wood or perhaps actual robes.⁹ This may of course refer to a particular cult practice where materials were placed on the images at certain periods in the cult calendar.

⁸ For the inscription see Durrbach and Roussel, 1935, no.1442.

⁹ See Bruneau, 1970,277-8.

Unfortunately no fragments of the actual statues survive and so little more can be said.

From a late fourth century temple at Dion, however, the picture is perhaps more revealing.

Demeter at Dion (catalogue number 5), fig. 8.

The only original head, from a definite cult statue of Demeter from a sanctuary was excavated at Dion in Macedonia. The head has not been thoroughly published, but is of particular interest here because of its small size, revealing that not all cult images had to be over life-size. The head is of competent, but not excellent workmanship and in appearance is conservative in style for the early Hellenistic period. Comparanda are scarce, but there are parallels amongst the statuettes dedicated at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Kyparissi on Kos. In general form the Dion Demeter compares well with one of the figures of Kore which is dated stylistically to the second half of the fourth century B.C., probably later in this period rather than earlier.¹⁰ Both heads have an oval structure with smooth transitions of skin over the underlying composition. The facial features are large and clearly defined, that is they do not follow the *sfumato* veneer popularised by the sculptor Praxiteles. The eyes are long, but do not taper to a point at their inner corners and the eyelids are well defined and sharply cut. The cheeks are full and the chins strong. There is a touch of severity about the facial expressions, again unlike most late Classical pieces, which is reminiscent of the Themis from Rhamnous, also early Hellenistic, and conservative in style. There are, however, both late Classical and early Hellenistic characteristics about the two heads. The hair is parted centrally and lies in thick, wavy locks which thicken out over the ears. The Dion Demeter wears a veil like

¹⁰ Kabus-Preisshofen, 1975, 31-65.

the Knidian Demeter, but is otherwise unlike that image and reveals a generally more provincial style.

The facial features of the Dion head are alert and the poise is frontal, with the direction of her gaze more intensely focused on the worshipper than is the case on the Knidos Demeter. The sculptor of the Knidian statue has isolated the goddess in her own intangible mythologies which were the basis of her religious rites. She is the Mourning Demeter who has lost her daughter for a third of the year. In the Knidos group Demeter was probably accompanied by her daughter standing beside her and the psychological relationship between the two goddesses would have been evident. This is a relationship which we shall encounter in other cult groups. The Dion Demeter may have been paired with her daughter, but this has not been substantiated as yet from the excavation of the sanctuary. It is clear that the Dion head represented an altogether different aspect of Demeter; that is as the Olympian Demeter. The Dion head has a more severe countenance with an inflexibility compatible with fifth century portrayals of the Olympian deities. At Dion the sculptor was motivated by a desire to portray a divine goddess and not merely to personify an abstract and psychological image of the grieving mother. In general the Dion Demeter reflects the "quiet" style of the early Hellenistic period and, like the Themis from Rhamnous and the Kallipolis goddesses, to be discussed shortly, reveals a provincial and conservative style.

The Third Century B.C.

During the third century B.C. sanctuaries dedicated to Demeter and Kore were constructed in various parts of the Hellenistic world. Most of the major new cities of Asia Minor possessed a shrine to the goddesses which were influenced by the Mysteries at Eleusis and often took on a form different to other temples. Priene and Pergamon both had important sanctuaries to the Eleusinian goddesses but other shrines were located in more provincial regions of Greece, such as the small temple at Kallipolis. At Pergamon and Kallipolis there are fragments of the cult images but at Priene no evidence for the cult image remains.

The Kallipolis Group (catalogue number 6), fig. 9.

From the first quarter of the century come the remains of the cult group of Demeter and Kore from their temple at Kallipolis in Aetolia. The statues have only recently been found and are as yet unpublished.¹¹ The remains of the Demeter are too fragmentary to assess in detail. It is known that Demeter was seated to the left of her standing daughter, but only parts of the limbs survive. The Kore is in a better state of preservation. Pausanias is our best source for the history of ancient Kallipolis but he does not mention the sanctuary or statues of the two goddesses.¹² Excavations have, however, corroborated the narrative of Pausanias and destruction levels show that the city was destroyed by the Gauls in about 279 - 278 B.C. The Temple of Demeter and Kore was built before, and

¹¹ The remains of the temple, cult statue base and the statues are currently being analyzed by Professor Themelis and will be published in the near future.

¹² Pausanias, 9.22.4.

survived the attack, and the only evidence for any repair work on the buildings dates to the Roman period.¹³ This destruction date suggests to us at least that the temple was built before the Gaulish attack and the style of the surviving Kore corresponds with the first part of the third century B.C.

The sanctuary lay to the north of the city and outside its walls. A peribolos wall enclosed the small temple, which had no colonnade, measured 4.80 x 4.90 metres and consisted of a cella with an opisthodomos added during the Roman period. The small scale of the temple is interesting particularly when one considers the size of the two cult images which were housed inside. The cella would have been extremely cramped, with the cult images and base filling almost half of the interior space. Other than this we must await the excavation report, after which, hopefully, the two cult images may be placed in a more informative context than is provided here.

From the few poor photographs of the Kore available, it is, however, possible to analyse the style and form of the figure and its relationship with its base and the seated Demeter. The temple was dedicated to both goddesses but the group is unusual in its conspicuous disengagement of the two statues. Demeter and Kore are usually shown together in an intimate manner, with the conventional use of physical contact to display their unity. This is obvious in earlier and later representations of the two deities. On the east pediment of the Parthenon, Demeter is leant upon by her daughter and on a beautiful relief now in

¹³ See Papachatzes, 1981, 375-379.

Athens, the standing Kore leans upon her mother.¹⁴ Later Hellenistic cult images show the two connected again, for instance the Lykosoura group where Demeter rests her arm on Kore's shoulder. In the Kallipolis group, however, the Kore turns her head towards her mother, but her gaze is directed upwards over her seated mother's head and there is no visual contact between the two.

As a cult image, the Kore is successfully conceived, but without the statue of her mother to complete the group, the movement of her head appears unusual. The statue was not intended as an independent and isolated figure, but as part of a group. The stance and pose are dignified and imposing but the inert and relaxed state of her body are in complete contrast to her facial features and the dynamically poised head. She is not a serene cult image and this is unusual for Kore who is usually depicted, like her mother, in a calm and pensive state. This may be the result of the sculptor's technique and style but it could have been the result of his intention to create a cult group which displayed a particular aspect of the cult of the two goddesses. One possible suggestion would be that he was portraying the moment when Kore had to return to the underworld, with the resultant tension between the two figures. It is not unreasonable to propose that cult images were so specific in their meaning, though without the Demeter the original motivation behind the group must remain a mystery.

Stylistically the group displays the prevalent mannerisms of the early Hellenistic period, with workmanship that is fine but not of excellent quality. The head appears to have

¹⁴ See National Museum, Athens no. 3572. Several reliefs at Eleusis show Demeter seated on a circular chest with Persephone standing beside her and Kern believed that this arrangement imitated the Eleusis cult statues.

been influenced by Skopas and it is not impossible that one of the members of his school was commissioned to produce the Kallipolis cult images. The eyes are widely opened and roll upwards in their deeply set sockets. The hair is Classical and the design of the drapery quite formal. The high girdle and the triangle of drapery between the breasts is typically early Hellenistic in date. Palagia believes that the prototype for the statue is preserved in a colossal female torso now in the Athenian Agora which possibly represents Themis or Demokratia.¹⁵ The two are almost identical in design with a sensuous modelling of the upper body beneath the almost diaphanous material of the chiton. This form of drapery, which clings closely to the upper body whilst the lower half is enveloped in a dense mass of deeply cut folds, is an aspect of many early third century pieces, including the statues of Dionysos and Comedy from Thasos and the Themis from Rhamnous.¹⁶ Other Hellenistic comparisons are provided by the statue of Hygieia from Gortyn, possibly a copy of one of the cult images at Kos and the Amphitrite on the coins from Tenos. Given all these examples it appears that there was some attempt to revive a more florid style in sculpture not seen since the early part of the fourth century at Epidauros, after which drapery forms became heavier, concealing the body to a greater extent. Thus the Kallipolis Kore can be dated with some certainty by several qualities, the architectural features of the temple, by her position in the development of sculpture and by a comparison with other dated pieces. For the remainder of the third century we must deal with less securely dated pieces and also with sculptures which do not have a definite cult function.

¹⁵ For this statue see Palagia, 1982, 99-113.

¹⁶ For the Dionysos see relevant section, for the Comedy see Ridgway 1990, pl.27 a-b. For the Themis from Rhamnous see Stewart, 1990, plate 602-3.

The Demeter at Pergamon (catalogue number 7), figs. 10-11.

Demeter had her own large sanctuary on the west slope of the Acropolis. The temple was an early one dedicated by Philetairos and his brother Eumenes I in the early third century, so an inscription informs us. The temple was Ionic and constructed of andesite with 7 x * 13 columns, with the altar consecrated at about the same time, also of andesite but decorated with marble volutes. Further development occurred in the second century B.C. when stoas, originally raised to enclose the temenos, were rebuilt in marble. An inscription on the frieze of the propylon to the temenos informs us that Queen Apollonia * erected these stoas and buildings as a votive offering to Demeter and Kore. This is another indication of the importance of women in the cult of the Eleusinian deities. Finally, a series of steps cut into the slope hints at a structure similar to the Eleusinian Telesterion at Pergamon, yet another example of Pergamon following Attic examples.

Four fragments of a statue were found in the pro-naos of the temple of Demeter at Pergamon but no trace of the base of the cult image was recovered. It is not certain whether the statue found is the cult image, and general opinion is that the fragments are not from the statue which stood in the cella. Most scholars dismiss the view of Hepding and claim that the cult image is more likely to be that which was copied onto a Roman relief and see no similarity between the fragments of statue and the relief portrayal.

Linfert, Schober and Radt all favour this theory and believe that the cult statue has been lost leaving Horn as the only scholar to attribute the fragments to the Demeter.¹⁷ The relief shows a standing Demeter in an attitude similar to that of the fragments and wearing

¹⁷ Linfert, 1976,206; Schober, 1951,50; Radt, 1988,213; Horn, 1931,52.

almost identical attire, the only difference being the reversal of the image from statue to relief. This reversal could be a result of the fact that the statue would only have been accessible to initiates of the Mysteries, and the carver of the relief may have either been working from memory or from a description. If the relief is a reasonably accurate depiction of the cult image, we can restore her as carrying a torch and a phiale and wearing a garland in her hair.

The temple's date is approximately the second quarter of the third century B.C. and this statue appears of similar date, the shallow indentation in the soles of the preserved left sandal indicating an early Hellenistic date. This is an initial stage in the development of sculpture at Pergamon and it is one of the earliest pieces of sculpture found at the site, displaying none of the flamboyant and Baroque characteristics which are frequent in later Pergamene works. The sculptor was undeniably trained in an Attic school, and the head can be compared to the small head of a goddess found in the Asklepieion on Kos, which is considered to be part of the decoration of the Altar of Asklepios by the sons of Praxiteles, Kephisodotos and Timarchos.¹⁸ The head is unlike Praxitelean heads in some respects, namely its rather sharp definition of the eyes and the slightly parted lips. The drapery style with its crisp and simply rendered folds and the high girdle all indicate an early Hellenistic date. In these features it can be compared to the Themis of Chairestratos and the Kallipolis Kore which both wear the usual high girdled chiton and himation around the hips.

¹⁸ For an analysis of the sons of Praxiteles and their work at Kos see Bieber, 1923-4, 242-275.

Stylistically the fragment of the head best compares with a female head from Kos, dated to 270 B.C. by Kabus-Priesshofen, a date not incompatible with the Pergamon fragments.¹⁹ The hair on each example is identically carved in crisp, regular channels which wave gently away from the centre parting and the locks are secured with bands. The foreheads are triangular and the brow slightly curved, as in Praxitelean heads. On closer examination both heads have a slight indentation between the cheeks and the nasolabial area which gives the cheeks a fleshy appearance. The shape of the eyes on both examples is long, with clearly delineated eyelids. Given these similarities both heads must date to the same period and were carved by sculptors who possibly trained in the school of Praxiteles or his sons, though were not as competent in producing the *sfumato* effect favoured by those sculptors. The essence of both heads is not unlike the Themis from Rhamnous in their sharp definition of features.

With regards to the Pergamon cult statue and a possible restoration, the temple is a small structure but large enough to accommodate such a life-sized, standing figure. A restoration of the statue and comparison with the Demeter on the relief suggests that the figure stood erect with her head frontal and eyes gazing directly into the plane in front of her, while holding a torch, a symbol of her chthonic character. This was a sanctuary of the Mysteries and the calm and aloof countenance of the probable cult image displays the sobriety required for such solemn rites. In this statue we have the agricultural goddess cloaked in her chthonic veil.

¹⁹ See Kabus-Priesshofen, 1989, 292-293, no.89, plate 34. The author sees a portrait character in the facial features but these are strongly idealised and the head probably represents either a goddess or a mortal woman.

Two third century heads of Demeter (catalogue numbers 25 and 26), figs. 82-83.

Two original heads, in all likelihood representing Demeter, provide us with interesting parallels and also display the development of styles during the century. The head now in Boston, but reported to have been found in Athens, provides a link between the great fourth century masters and their schools, and the Baroque style of the later part of the century. Caskey believed that the head came from a cult figure of the goddess of the time of Praxiteles, and was thus late Classical in date.²⁰ But comparisons with Praxitelean sculpture are unsatisfactory and the head, if it is indeed the work of a fourth century sculptor, has more in common with Skopas. More convincing analogies can be found amongst third century heads, however, such as the Asklepios from Melos and a head of Dionysos from Thasos, Choregic Monument A.²¹ Another comparable piece is the head of Demeter from Kos. All these heads have full, rounded modelling with triangular foreheads and fleshy, soft eyelids. They have pronounced cheekbones with a slight indentation between the outer corners of the eye and the start of the cheek. The hair is similar on all examples in the manner in which it swells out over the ears and is carved a sketchy fashion rather than in the meticulously arranged locks of Praxitelean heads. Their common bond, however, is the way in which they correspond with the heads of the goddesses on the Great Altar Gigantomachy. Thimme first noticed the link between the Koan head and some of the deities on the Gigantomachy, principally Theia, Helios and Eos.²² Frel observed how close the Koan Demeter was to Rhodian works and raises the

²⁰ Caskey, 1923, 67.

²¹ For the Thasos head see Smith, 1991, fig.80.

²² See Thimme, 1946, plate 20 for the similarities.

important point that Rhodian sculptors are known to have worked on the Altar.²³ All this is very interesting, but the two heads of Demeter are not products of such a mature Baroque style, and probably represent, instead, an early stage in its development, yet one is Attic, the other Koan, and this suggests that we must not look for specific styles in certain geographical locations. Sculptors travelled widely in the third century as the Melos and Thasian heads also reveal and so we could reasonably suggest that such early pieces displaying the roots of the dynamic Asiatic Baroque style were important in its development. This is perhaps an example of stretching the evidence too far and probing for a sequence in the development of sculpture too deeply. These heads, however, are important in creating a tenuous, though nonetheless viable link between the Attic and Rhodian schools of the early Hellenistic period, and the origins of the Baroque style in sculpture.

Returning to the Boston and Koan heads, we are presented with benevolent and sympathetic portrayals of the goddess where the eyes do not look directly at the worshipper. There is, in effect, no direct relationship between the goddess and her devotees. It is possible that these heads were both part of a cult group consisting of Kore also. In both cases the angle of the necks suggest standing figures who may have turned towards statues of Kore. So little, however, is known about the context of the heads that it would be rash to attempt too complete a restoration of the original appearance of the cult figures. The significance of these pieces is their dissimilarity with the Pergamon Demeter and the Kallipolis pair who appear more conservative in design and style.

²³ Frel, 1971, 124, n.19.

From the third century B.C., therefore, the evidence for cult statues of the two goddesses becomes varied and interesting. The Kallipolis pair provide an invaluable addition to our knowledge of early Hellenistic cult images, which are rare on the whole, and the Boston and Koan heads reveal the vibrant modelling style and sensual facial features that can be paralleled amongst works classified as Asiatic Baroque. From the late third to second centuries important evidence remains to show the rising importance of Demeter and Kore in religious terms.

The Second Century B.C.

Due to the recent re-dating of Damophon, his cult images can probably be dated between about 220 - 190 B.C., though it is difficult to determine which sites and statues he worked on at a certain period. At Megalopolis and Lykosoura, Pausanias saw and described the colossal cult images, and from the latter site several substantial portions of the group survive. In addition to these, there are two possible cult figures of Kore, one from Knossos dated to the first half of the century and the other from Kyzikos in Asia Minor dated to the second half. The second century saw an increase in commissions for new cult images, particularly in mainland Greece in which few new temples had been constructed in the third century. Within mainland Greece, it was the Peloponnese which benefited most from this revival of interest in sanctuaries. The two great masters in this enterprise were Eukleides and Damophon and it is possible from literary sources and surviving fragments to assess the influences of these two sculptors on the iconography of Demeter and Kore.

Two interesting and informative groups were the cult images of the Great Goddesses at Megalopolis and Lykosoura in Arkadia, both described by Pausanias. Both commissions were undertaken by Damophon, a sculptor from Messene but it is not clear which group was the earlier. The Megalopolis group, however, may have preceded that at Lykosoura, the latter, rural site perhaps emulating the cult images of the Great Goddesses at this city and employing the same sculptor.

Damophon's group at Megalopolis

The dedication of the cult group at Megalopolis was most likely an element in the rebuilding of the city after its destruction by Kleomenes of Sparta in 223 B.C. The Eleusinian cult may have been introduced to revitalise the local rural cult of the Maid, Despoina, whose sanctuary remained in the city but appeared subordinate to that of the Great Eleusinian goddesses, Demeter and Kore.²⁴ Dickens successfully analysed the cult of the Great Goddesses and informs us that the cult may have been introduced by four men, one of whom may have originated from Attica.²⁵ The cult group, not surviving other than in Pausanias' s description, consisted of Demeter and Kore, both fifteen feet high and presumably, though not certainly, seated. The Demeter was constructed completely in stone but Kore was acrolithic and had wooden drapery. The two statues being of different material and techniques is highly unusual, but the decision to carve Kore's garments out of wood may have been based upon traditional and religious considerations and was perhaps intended to relate Kore to the earlier, Arkadian goddess.

²⁴ Pausanias informs us that the sanctuary of the Maid stood next to that of the Great Goddesses and the cult statue was eight feet high and still worshipped, Pausanias, 8.31.8.

²⁵ Dickens, 1905-6,128.

In the same city, Damophon also produced the cult images of Aphrodite and Hermes, again using different techniques for the individual figures.

Damophon's use of ancillary decoration and figures was a popular element in his construction of cult images, as we shall shortly see in the discussion of the Lykosoura cult group below, and at Megalopolis this consisted of three smaller, female statues which were positioned in front of the Great Goddesses. Pausanias tells us that they were either intended to represent the daughters of the sculptor or, more plausibly, Artemis, Athena and Kore. They were shown picking flowers and there is an obvious reference to the abduction of the latter goddess by Hades. A small statue of Herakles was also part of the group and placed beside Demeter. Thus the Megalopolis group represented Demeter and Kore in their Eleusinian guise but the cult image of Kore retained enough elements of the earlier goddess, the Maid, to provide a continuity of the earlier cult. The little evidence which we can deduce from the description of Megalopolis in Pausanias is augmented by the surviving sculptures from Lykosoura which provide us with a clearer picture of Damophon's style.

The Lykosoura Cult Group (catalogue number 8) figs. 12-31

The group at Lykosoura survives in large fragments which now dominate the small museum at the site, whilst other fragments can be seen in Athens. The Lykosoura group provide us with the most complete arrangement of cult figures from any period of Greek sculpture and are therefore of the utmost importance. The problem of the date of Damophon's career has been exhaustively studied throughout this century by many

scholars, but more recently scholars have preferred a date in the first half of the second century B.C. This dating has, however, recently been challenged by Themelis who argues convincingly, that Damophon's career should be dated to at least a generation beforehand, which would push his early works back into the late third century B.C.

His arguments rest not on style alone, which is always an unreliable means for dating sculpture, but on epigraphical evidence.²⁶ In addition, the amount of contracts that Damophon acquired reveals that his career must have been a long one and shows that his sons and members of his workshop assisted him in his work. These conclusions are based upon an inscribed column found at Messene which honours the sculptor Damophon, son of Phillipos and also his sons. Themelis suggests that 190 B.C. is the very latest date that can be ascribed to the inscription, basing his claim on the method in which Damophon was rewarded for his work. A handsome sum was paid to the sculptor in embossed, silver tetradrachmae bearing the portrait of Alexander the Great. These were issued frequently throughout the later third and early second centuries B.C., but their production ceased in about 190 B.C. Therefore this epigraphic evidence provides us with the latest date for most of Damophon's work in the Peloponnese.

This would also fit with the date the destruction of Megalopolis by Kleomenes of Sparta in 223 B.C. The city quickly recovered and must have initiated the reconstruction of its sanctuaries shortly afterwards. Therefore the years 223 - 190 B.C. may have witnessed the peak of Damophon's career, a period which would also agree with the refurbishment of the sanctuaries at Messene. It is fair then to assume that Damophon may have made

²⁶ Themelis, 1993 (2),24-40.

his name at Megalopolis and have earned commissions in other Arkadian, Messenian and Achaean cities.²⁷ Shortly afterwards several villages may have been emancipated from the conglomeration ruled by the city of Megalopolis and Lykosoura was conceivably included amongst them, although it may have gained its freedom earlier. The temple may have been planned at this time as a symbol of the newly found freedom of the village, perhaps to edify its local ancient cult. Most of the inscriptions found in the temenos can * be dated to the first half of the 2nd century B.C. and the initiator of the emancipation movement of the villages, Philopoimen, is mentioned frequently. It could be imagined that this man was the figure behind the temple's foundation, though there is little evidence to substantiate this.

To return to the Lykosoura group, the last years of the third century and the early years of the second century would be a most suitable time for the people of Lykosoura to have sufficient civic control to commission a new temple and a notable sculptor to take on such a contract. Civic pride and emancipation from the conglomeration of Megalopolis was surely the stimulus to edify their local cult. The employment of Damophon may also be regarded as an act of one-upmanship on the part of the Lykosourans; employing a sculptor who had carved the cult images of the Great Goddesses at Megalopolis must have carried some element of competition and emulation.

A brief architectural history of the sanctuary is necessary to place the cult images in their context. The sanctuary at Lykosoura in Arcadia is little known to modern scholars. Since

²⁷ The columnar inscription also mentions other cities and islands who honoured Damophon and presumably we should interpret this as evidence of his commissions outside the Peloponnese.

its excavation, late in the last century, the site has been virtually ignored, only the cult statues from the temple have been given any consideration and then somewhat briefly. The sanctuary was dedicated to Despoina, a local rural deity similar to Kore. In the early years of the cult's activity she was possibly identified with the Great Mother, an ancient earth goddess, but when Megalopolis was established, a similar shrine at that city was dedicated to Demeter and Kore, with Kore being identified with Despoina. At the neighbouring village of Lykosoura, the shrine to Despoina had probably existed prior to the foundation of Megalopolis. The Hellenistic shrines at both places were thus dedicated to both of the Eleusinian goddesses and at Lykosoura, Damophon's great cult group depicted both the mother and daughter of equal size, an indication of parallel importance at the shrine.

The architectural remains at the site have posed several problems, chiefly in the interpretation of their date, suggestions for which range from the fourth century B.C. to the Hadrianic period. The latter date, however, was arrived at after excavations around the base of the group yielded Hadrianic coins but these indicate not the inauguration of the group but rather a repair to the base and possibly the statues. The temple at Lykosoura is of the Doric order and was designed as a hexastyle prostyle with a stylobate measuring 11.15 x 21.34 metres. The cella was divided by two blocks forming two sections with the eastern end containing a mosaic, probably not added until the Roman period, while the western end contained the colossal cult group by Damophon. Fragments of the cult group reveal a composition of Demeter and Despoina seated on a throne with Artemis and the Titan Anytos standing to either side of the goddesses, as Stewart's reconstruction shows (fig. 12); the huge base is preserved in situ.

The framework of the temple was constructed of limestone but later Roman ornamentation was of marble and these additions reveal that the popularity of the cult continued well into the Roman period. These latter additions are conspicuous, not only in their use of a different material, but also in the inferior quality of the carving. Comparisons with other buildings are based on architectural features, particularly the style of the mouldings and the proportions used. In terms of the latter, the Palaestra at Olympia, dating to the late 3rd century, has been cited as being similar. On the whole, the temple of Despoina was constructed as economically as possible, which is understandable as the sanctuary was not a showplace for competition between the wealthier Hellenistic dynasts. Instead, local statesmen displayed their wealth and prestige at the site usually in the form of statues or inscriptions.

A large altar was also constructed near the temple which was divided into three portions and consecrated to Demeter, Despoina and the Great Mother. Another possible cult at Lykosoura was one to Artemis, an intriguing inclusion in the cult group, explained by a local legend which makes Artemis a daughter of Demeter; at this site she would have been worshipped in her chthonic guise.

The important issue here, however, is to analyse the style of the cult images and their possible date. The main point of dispute is that the sculpture at Lykosoura and other statues by Damophon, have been labelled classicising by most scholars. This misinterpretation of the stylistic objectives of Damophon, and similar sculptors, has all too often hindered an unprejudiced study of the sculpture. In his recent book, Smith has

challenged the traditional views on the so-called classicising sculpture of the second century, maintaining that religious sculpture, ie cult statues, were intrinsically conservative in their nature and appearance.²⁸ This is a valid point, but the potential criticisms here are threefold; firstly did Damophon produce cult images in a deliberately retrospective style ? Secondly, did his patron specify that the cult images should appear old fashioned to enhance the antiquity of the cult ? Thirdly should we consider Damophon as an innovative and thoroughly Hellenistic sculptor in style ?

No Greek sculptor was thoroughly original in his style, but Smith makes a pertinent observation in which he doubts that Damophon's images would have appeared deliberately old fashioned to second century spectators.²⁹ This is in almost direct opposition to Stewart's opinion that the style of Damophon's group would have generated responses amounting to his sculptures being labelled Neo-Phidian.³⁰ Stewart appears to promote the view that Damophon was entirely dependant on earlier works, particularly those by Phidias, for his inspiration, that his sculpture was eclectic and that the sculptor had no innovative ideas of his own. This view that Damophon was indebted to Phidias and emulated the great master, probably arises from the fact that he repaired the cult statue of Zeus at Olympia. Because of this commission, scholars have endeavoured to define elements in Damophon's style that imitate Phidias and have seen similarities where in fact there are none. This is the result of a misunderstanding of the works of Damophon and of the criteria by which cult images were restricted. Themelis makes the valid point that, if we are to accept the new dates for Damophon's career, that is 223 - 190 B.C., his style

²⁸ Smith, 1991,241.

²⁹ Pers.corr. June 1992.

³⁰ Stewart, 1990, 96.

cannot be characterised as a classicising reaction to Pergamene Baroque: the latter style had not yet reached its zenith on the Pergamene altar and reactions to artistic excesses usually only occur when that style is at its peak or in decline. Only a study of the appearance and style of Damophon's cult images will answer questions concerning his influences or his importance in the development of mid Hellenistic sculpture.

The Group as a whole

It is essential that Damophon's cult group at Lykosoura is dealt with as a whole. The individual figures have all too often been considered in their fragmentary state with each statue disengaged from the others. In their present display even the original fragments are not exhibited collectively but rather the heads and decorative fragments of drapery are in Athens whilst the larger pieces of torsos and limbs are at Lykosoura. The reconstruction in the latter museum, though still incomplete, reveals the immense size of the Demeter and Artemis which can evoke astonishment and awe even today. Thus the statues must be studied first as a group and then as individual statues which will be analyzed briefly to define elements of Damophon's style and importance as a creator of cult images.

At Lykosoura it was the younger of the two goddesses who was the senior deity in cult practices but she is shown as equal in size and splendour to her mother in the cult group. She was the local fertility goddess, known as Despoina "the Mistress" but assimilated to Kore as the daughter of Demeter. The primary difference is in her genealogy, with her father being, not Zeus, but Poseidon who coupled with Demeter when she disguised herself as a Mare. The legend is of Arkadian origin and Pausanias details this quite

convincingly in his discussion.³¹ How far these differences between Kore and Despoina affect the iconography of Demeter's daughter will be investigated below. Artemis is similar in this respect in that the legend of her birth is also transformed at Lykosoura, where she too is considered a daughter of Demeter. Artemis also had a sanctuary at Lykosoura where she was worshipped under the title "The Guider" and her statue held two long torches. These attributes are usually those of Demeter and her daughter, so perhaps at Lykosoura this image was set up to show the relationship between Demeter and Artemis. Anytos is the more obscure character in the group, but of no less importance as it was he who was responsible for the safety of Despoina as an infant. That Anytos was included in the group instead of Poseidon, whom the surviving figure resembles, but surely is not, is perhaps linked with the rather sordid role of Poseidon in the myth. Poseidon, however, is not ignored in the cult group as sea creatures play a prominent role in the relief decoration of the drapery and on the throne. Finally the ancillary decoration of the drapery of Despoina and ornamentation of the elaborate throne are equally significant as part of the cult group. These elements form a harmonious and united assemblage which communicate the myth surrounding the birth of Despoina and the activities involved in her worship at the sanctuary; take one of these figures or decorative devices away and the cult group appears incomplete and discordant. Thus it has been established that the importance of the Lykosoura group is its communicative function; it is not merely a collection of deities and decoration but a method of involving the initiates in the ceremony and mysteries of the cult and the personalities involved. This sense of contact with the worshipper is enhanced all the more by the scale of the cult group.

³¹ Pausanias, 8,37,3-5.

The dimensions of the group were an important element in their visual impact on the spectator. The central goddesses, in their seated positions, are 5.60 metres in height including their base, and the four figures occupied the whole of the width of the cella. Anyone entering the temple would have immediately been overwhelmed by the four colossal figures reaching almost to the ceiling. Artemis and Anytos, in their standing positions, were approximately the same height as the seated goddesses and were thus on a smaller scale. Stewart's reconstruction has the central goddesses projected forwards on their throne and the two side figures standing behind on either side. The image on a coin from the site confirms this, as does the remains of the base of the group which is still in situ.³² Artemis and Anytos were placed at the sides and slightly behind the two central figures, but in their standing positions would have appeared in perspective and so any discrepancies, in terms of the sizes of the four figures, would have been adjusted. The entire group would have been an overwhelming sight to the spectator and any visual impact would have been enhanced by the amount of light available to illuminate the statues. Unlike most Greek temples, that at Lykosoura had an additional door on the south side of the cella as well as the usual main door to the east. This may have permitted the bright midday sun to light the statues, though the sharp rise in ground, to the south of the temple, would possibly have hindered the sun's rays from penetrating the cella. Alternatively, it is possible that the cella was maintained in a permanent state of semi-darkness, in keeping with the celebration of mystery rites, which would have evoked the awe and suspense compatible with the ceremony. This is of course supposition but due to the small size of the temple suggests that the cult images would probably have been dimly lit.

³² See Dickins, 1910-11, 80-87 for an illustration of the coin.

Colour was an additional factor in the presentation of the cult group. Traces of pigment, surviving on some fragments of the sculptures, indicate that the drapery of the two central goddesses may have been tinted with dark shades, particularly red, indigo and black. The drapery of Demeter may have been painted black which refers perhaps to her Phigaleian cult where she was worshipped as Black Demeter.³³ So the group was painted in order to highlight the intricately carved detail particularly that of Despoina's veil where the imagery was ritually symbolic and therefore visually important. The inlaid eyes of the two smaller figures would also have enhanced the visual impact of the group as would metal additions and the spears and torches held by the individual figures. There is, however, a sobriety about the group which manifested itself in the play of colour and light which, if illuminated from the side by the south door, may have resulted in a *chiaroscuro* effect. The drapery folds were deeply undercut contrasting with the flatter planes of material and the stark, wide-eyed features of the heads. This conjecture and reconstruction demands a great deal of imagination today but is important to note as we have lost so much of the additional detail.

The use of colour and the available light source would also have helped to obscure any flaws in the construction of the group, as shown by Pausanias's response to the statues. Damophon's group does not rank amongst the finest Hellenistic works in terms of execution, for instance the backs of the figures are not worked but are hollowed out. These shortcomings have perhaps more to do with alleviating the weight of the figures, economising on marble (Lykosoura was not a wealthy or large community) and, in any case, it should be remembered that the backs of the sculptures would not have been

³³ Pausanias, 8,42,1-11.

visible. The upper extremities, particularly the arms and hands, are rather inadequately rendered but feet are carefully and sensitively handled.³⁴ This may have been because the hands were not visible to the spectator whereas the feet were at eye level. Admittedly these deficiencies in carving are not the hallmarks of a first rate sculptor but it is difficult to compare Damophon's cult images with Classical cult figures as few survive. The fifth century examples may have contained as many flaws but these would have been concealed both by paint and by the dark conditions in which they were displayed. It seems more probable that any deficiencies in the group were the result of the technical difficulties of the piecing together of the statues rather than negligence on the part of the sculptor.

The Individual figures

The central core of the cult group consisted of Demeter and Despoina seated on an elaborate, high backed throne. The two goddesses were of equal height and united by the intimate gesture of Demeter placing her arm around the shoulders of her daughter. The sculptural unit of the two deities was basically square in form but with the vertical and horizontal lines broken by the diagonal movements of Demeter holding a torch out to her right, and Despoina carrying a sceptre to her left. The group is frontal with only a slight twist in Demeter's body and head to her left. This arrangement of the two seated goddesses is not revolutionary in composition but the design does not seem directly related or intended to reproduce the Demeter and Kore on the east pediment of the Parthenon, as Stewart and Dickens both propose.³⁵ What seems evident is that the arrangement at

³⁴ Dickens noted this in his catalogue of the fragments, 1905-6,390-1.

³⁵ Stewart, 1990,94 and Dickens 1905-6,396.

Lykosoura is merely a convenient and effective method of placing mother and daughter together and one cannot assume that Damophon deliberately imitated the design from the Athenian pediment. If Damophon had selected a famous, fifth century prototype for the two goddesses it would have been more appropriate to choose major cult images to copy, perhaps those at Eleusis, though as we have pointed out it may have been difficult to gain access to these. Whatever Damophon's influences were depends on the style of the cult images; were they directly based on Classical models, were they eclectic pieces or were they totally original ?

Despoina

The Despoina is preserved only in fragments, but from these it is possible to reconstruct the appearance of the figure. This colossal statue is, in essence, a quietly seated, draped young woman, but was originally extremely ornate in design owing to the attributes which she held and her decorative drapery. The head is not preserved but it is possible that it was of a type similar to her mother's. What separates the Despoina from her mother, and raises her slightly in ritual significance, is her elaborately decorated garment and the small, rectangular cist which she held in her left hand. The only details to separate this goddess from Kore, in iconographical terms, are the reliefs which decorate her veil, depicting scenes from the cult practices and rituals, possibly performed in her sanctuary. The figure of Despoina probably evolved from an amalgam of locally important earth and vegetation goddesses. Firstly she assumed the role of nature deity and fertility goddess; a cult suited to the rural landscape around Lykosoura. Along with Artemis she assumed the title of goddess of the wilderness, and the semi-human figures which decorated the veil highlight

her association with the countryside and wild beasts. Stewart has successfully analysed the symbols and designs which adorned the veil but does not really consider the possibility that Despoina is not totally isolated from the goddess Kore.³⁶ A faint allusion to that goddess is represented in relief on the veil with a series of eagles and thunderbolts; these being the insignia of Zeus, Kore's father. The suggestion, though somewhat fragile, is there, and is no less significant than the indications as to Poseidon being the father of Despoina, through the presence of marine creatures on the veil and tritons and nereids on the throne decoration. It appears that Damophon intended Despoina to be distinct from Kore and achieved this with the use of supplementary decoration but without these the statue could easily be mistaken for Kore. Joined with her mother, Despoina sits on an impressively carved, marble throne which was decorated exquisitely with floral motifs and marine creatures, and they sit in a stately pose with their torches and sceptres to signify their chthonic and Olympian status. The darker side of these goddesses is also evident in the Demeter.

Demeter

The colossal figure of Demeter sits in a similar position to her daughter though with a simpler form of drapery. Her head is preserved and is worthy of particular attention. In spite of its Classical framework, consisting of large, round eyes and circular form of the cheeks, brow and chin, the head is unique and unlike any other head of Demeter preserved. The Lykosoura goddess is a more mature and matronly Demeter, quite different to the Knidian statue. The torso is carved in a sensuous manner but the pose is

³⁶ Stewart, 1990,94-96.

more regal and inflexible than the usual renditions of the goddess. Here she is the true Olympian goddess shaded only by the darker undertones of her chthonic character; the black of her drapery alluding to her obscure Mystery cult.

The statue has most frequently been categorised as classicising and is compared to fifth century creations. The misuse of that stylistic term and its relationship with second century sculpture has already been outlined and any close examination of the piece reveals the Hellenistic characteristics of the style. Many of the features of the Demeter are alien to Classical sculpture but compare well with contemporary Hellenistic pieces. The clinging chiton over her breasts and upper body and the low swinging neckline do indeed recall the figures on the eastern pediment of the Parthenon, particularly figures K,L,M, but parallels are more distinct and obvious with other Hellenistic sculptures. The diaphanous and restless treatment of the chiton, particularly over the stomach, is a device apparent on the Nike of Samothrake. There are also variations in the design of the drapery on the Demeter; at the front the chiton clings closely to the body, outlining its contours, but at the sides the material hangs in deeper folds obscuring the hips and waistline beneath. This device is also evident on the Nike and is Hellenistic in origin, placing Damophon securely within the ranks of Hellenistic sculptors. The Nike is far superior in quality and technique but the similarities are not to be ignored. Another parallel is the so-called Agora\ Dion Aphrodite which is carved in a similarly sensuous manner with the clinging drapery rendered to reveal the female form.

The facial features of Demeter also have Hellenistic parallels. Alscher proposed that the character of the Demeter recalls the heads of the goddesses on the Great Altar frieze at

Pergamon, particularly the head of the so-called Nyx or Persephone. Parallels of style can be observed in the small, fleshy mouth and wide open eyes. The impressionistic treatment of the hair, so often found on colossal figures, is difficult to parallel but the locks were probably highlighted and isolated with paint for higher definition. One major difference with the Pergamene sculptures, which is also evident on the Artemis from Damophon's group, is the shape of the eyes. The small eyes have an arched upper eyelid but the lower lid is horizontal, particularly when seen from below, a position from which the figures would have been visible on their high base. In this respect, the Anytos is different in that the lower eyelid is curved quite prominently more like the figures on the Gigantomachy from Pergamon.

The peaceful expression of the Demeter differs from the usual depictions of the sorrowful mourning Demeter. Here we have the goddess of agriculture and fertility, the Olympian deity and mother goddess, protecting her daughter. The Despoina and Demeter are a dark and mysterious pair who are combined in this chthonic cult and whose rites promised salvation to the initiates. Damophon's Demeter is joined with her daughter, not separated from her, and they form a single unit of worship in this group, functioning as images for a local fertility cult. In style the Demeter combines elements of Classical design but no more than the sculptures from Pergamon, which also blend fifth century and Baroque elements. The appearance is one of an innovative and original design, not of the finest quality but nonetheless an impressive and imposing cult image.

Anytos

This style and quality can also be seen in the two subsidiary figures of Anytos and Artemis. Anytos was not an Olympian deity, but his presence in the Lykosoura group presents two interesting concepts. Firstly his mythological and ritual relationship with Despoina and secondly his thoroughly Baroque form and appearance. Given the fragmentary state of the Anytos it is difficult to assess the original impact that the statue had on its spectators but from the head alone it is possible to reconstruct another element of Damophon's style.

The head of Anytos is described and illustrated in most textbooks on Greek sculpture but its significance as a piece of sculpture has perpetually been obscured by the stigma of being labelled neo-classical. Alscher's description of the head is, however, one of the most illuminating and precise examinations of Damophon's work. He describes it as a mixture of dynamic force and severe nobility. The Anytos has had, however, an equal amount of criticism amounting to the opinion that it is an eclectically confusing piece in which the sculptor was attempting to transform the Baroque style and, in this process, attempting to temper it and down by incorporating classical elements.³⁷ Becatti took this further and believed that Damophon's Anytos bewildered second century onlookers by not adhering to one set of rules or conventions and is thus not successful.³⁸ Pollitt further complicates the argument by asserting that the Anytos was probably based upon the Olympian Zeus of Phidias.³⁹ We have little idea of what the Olympian Zeus by Phidias

³⁷ Stewart 1979,40.

³⁸ Becatti, 1940,41.

³⁹ Pollitt, 1986,165.

actually looked like but the Anytos has little in common with coin representations of the statue. These scholars are, in effect, placing Damophon firmly in the hypothetical school of mid second century classicists. Thus the Anytos needs to be discussed and compared to other second century sculptures and in the context of those which have also been erroneously labelled neo-classical.

The Anytos has frequently been likened to the aforementioned Aegira Dionysos, the Asklepios of Mounychia and the Poseidon of Melos. On close inspection the only bond between the sculptures is that they are representations of bearded, father gods; apart from that, they are remarkably different. On the Anytos the sketchily formed hair and beard have a plastic appearance and fluid form with each strand of hair less distinctly rendered than on the other three heads. In terms of the "wild" and erratic hairstyle, the Anytos has more in common with the head of the Old Centaur in the Capitoline, which is probably a copy of a Pergamene work of the early second century B.C.⁴⁰ This, however, is an example of the Baroque style taken to its extreme. Another parallel, which is similar more in terms of its inspirations and objectives rather than its overall appearance, is the so-called "Wild Man" found near the Asklepieion at Pergamon.⁴¹ The Anytos is a more restrained piece with calmer, more composed features, and is therefore in harmony with the cult group in general and the appearance of cult images on the whole. Anytos also has a more solid facial structure which contrasts effectively with the plasticity of his hair. If we accept the new date for Damophon's work, then, it seems, he was experimenting with the new dynamic treatment of drapery, facial features and forms. He would in all

⁴⁰ See Smith, 1991, fig.163. It is possible that on this statue the hair has been elaborated to suit the ornamental element of its function and to Roman taste.

⁴¹ See De Luca, 1984, 143-4, plate 65.

likelihood have witnessed the Attalid dedications of the late third century B.C. on the Athenian Acropolis. Damophon acquired the basic principles of the Baroque style and they filtered into his work where the style suited the particular character portrayed. Anytos was an elderly deity and the effect of depicting him as a bearded and fatherly figure is bound to have evoked images of Olympian bearded gods, but, as we have discovered, this link is somewhat tenuous.

The Anytos is in perfect harmony with the rest of the figures in the Lykosoura cult group. Like the Demeter his gaze was fixed directly onto the plane in front of him and his expression is alert, dignified and visually stunning. His role in the group is as a divine protector of the goddess Despoina, and he is, therefore, an important element in the cult practices. His warrior-like appearance, with his cuirassed tunic and spear, enhances his defensive function.

Artemis

The statue of Artemis completed the cult group and she originally stood to the height of 3.70 metres. Several parts of her body are preserved, thus enabling a reconstruction. Of great importance is the style of the piece and how it relates to the iconography of the goddess. A separate section will deal with Artemis but here it is important to assess her relationship with the group as a whole. Various scholars have attempted to isolate the type used for Damophon's Artemis but none have considered how original the Artemis may have been. Dickens and Pollitt favour a Praxitelean model, either a version of one of the master's statues or one carved by one of his pupils. Pollitt suggests the Artemis

Brauronia on the Acropolis at Athens.⁴² This, however, appears to be yet another instance of the widespread view that Damophon took all his influences from Athens which is, of course, mistaken. The facial features of the Artemis are slightly more sensitively carved than those of the Demeter but when the statue was originally in place on its base, the features would have been seen from a different angle than we see them in the museum today. When viewed from below the features of Artemis appear harsher and heavier, in fact, the Artemis does not compare well with a Praxitelean head when analyzed closely. The head of the Knidian Aphrodite has a more curved brow with a high peaked forehead and the cheeks are clearly defined with a distinct tension between the flesh and the bone structure. The Artemis has none of these characteristics. The eyes of the Artemis do not conform to the usual Praxitelean model of long, almond shaped eyes with gently closing lids, the lower of which usually merges into the upper cheek. Damophon's Artemis has fully opened, round eyes with short narrow arches forming the lids and eyebrows, not the broad, shallow curves of the Aphrodite; the two heads are, in fact, almost entirely different. The Artemis is a vigorous piece with the effect of life and movement filling the statue particularly in her widely dilated nostrils which appear to take in a breath of air. None of the facial features exude the dreamy complacency of a statue by Praxiteles or his school; the Artemis is thoroughly Hellenistic.

The figure of Artemis then, takes on a more monumental appearance and has little Praxitelean mildness. Looking from a low angle the head appears relatively small and poised on a long neck with the gaze looking upwards slightly. In terms of the contrast between the small head and broad, matronly body she compares well with the Capitoline

⁴² Dickens, 1971,61; Pollitt, 1986,165.

Hera which is possibly an original of the Pergamene school. Another area of comparison between these two statues is the slight torsion of the figures. The upper half of Artemis swings to her left whilst the hips and legs move in a brisk step to her right. This movement defines the figure as fully contemporary and detracts from any criticisms of the statue being Classicistic. The Hellenistic character of the statue can also be recognised in her drapery which is Pergamene in form but different to the diaphanous material that forms Demeter's dress. The heavy materials of the tunic and the animal skin wrapped around her middle conceals the forms of her body beneath. The relationship is not between body and drapery but between the different layers and textures of the garments; a thoroughly Hellenistic device and design.

The head of Artemis is of a very individual type and exact parallels are rare. The only statue of the goddess which preserves the same hairstyle is one found at Ephesos which is a mediocre Roman work.⁴³ Both heads have the so-called melon coiffure and have a similar large circular form, cheeks and chin. The eyes of the Ephesos head are, however, quite different to Damophon's Artemis. They are more deeply set, longer in form and overshadowed by a wider and flatter brow. The exact relationship between the two statues is difficult to determine. Both may have been inspired by a similar model, perhaps dated to the early Hellenistic period, hence the hairstyle, but the Lykosoura Artemis appears more Pergamene in facial structure and has a flamboyant drapery design. The eager and animated features of the Artemis can be compared to the Artemis on the Great Altar frieze, as both have small, short and fleshy mouths and widely opened eyes which are

⁴³ See Kahil in LIMC II, 1984,646,no.270.

imbued with energy and vitality. Damophon's style has not yet reached the extremities of the Pergamene style works but it anticipates the Gigantomachy.

The Artemis, like the Despoina, was also highly decorative. She wore rings, bracelets and a belt which retains the holes where additional decoration could be attached. Her sandals preserve traces of red paint and are of an elaborate type. The hair was richly conceived, with a band maintaining its arrangement and she had inlaid eyes of some semi-precious material. She originally carried a quiver over her back which is just discernible on the coin showing the group, a torch in her raised right hand and serpents in the other. A hunting dog rested at her feet to complete the image. The whole effect of the Artemis must have been visually stunning and she may have functioned as the Guiding Artemis, similar to her role in her sanctuary elsewhere at Lykosoura.

The most unusual feature of the group is the use of ancillary decoration. Part of this, the decorated veil of Despoina, has already been considered and, to recapitulate, it appears that the minutely carved and probably painted designs were intended to reproduce an actual woven garment which may have been placed over an earlier wooden *xoanon*. Torches play a prominent role in the iconography and are typical characteristics of the Eleusinian or Great Goddesses. At Lykosoura they may have symbolised the salvation provided by the initiation into the mysteries and the light needed to reach the underworld. The relevance of the cist which Despoina holds is not obvious, and has no parallels, but must refer to some ritual aspect of the cult practices. The serpents probably recall an

earlier goddess, whose associations with the wild, as goddess of nature led to the inclusion of serpents in her iconography.⁴⁴

On the whole, the cult group at Lykosoura is a curious combination of different personalities whose local Arkadian legend brings them together into a successfully conceived sculptural unit. The impression which the colossal images conveyed in such a small temple must have been remarkable and Pausanias records, as an unusual finishing touch, that a mirror was placed at the exit of the temple in which the cult statues were visible but the onlooker not.⁴⁵ The motive for this is inexplicable but again added mystery to the rites. The group also stands as an example of the style of Damophon, a sculptor whose reputation should be enhanced by his popularity during the high Hellenistic period as a creator of cult images. The importance of the development at Lykosoura is that it shows how significant local, rural sanctuaries could be in the Hellenistic period. But it also reveals how assimilation of similar cults could advance and revitalise an ancient sanctuary, particularly when the cult involved the Mystery deities so popular in the period.

The Knossos Kore (catalogue number 9), fig. 32.

From the first half of the century comes a small statue of Kore which was found in the Sanctuary of Demeter at Knossos on Crete. This is a possible cult image which may have been erected in the small temple dedicated to the two goddesses in the city. The temple

⁴⁴ Serpents are also evident on other figures associated with chthonic rituals, particularly the Nyx on the north frieze of the Gigantomachy, who may in fact be Persephone or Demeter.

⁴⁵ Pausanias, 8,37,7.

dates to the Classical period, though little more than scanty foundations remain. The cult of Demeter may have developed from a vegetation cult, with Kore being a later addition to the rites, bringing in a chthonic element and, if this is the cult figure, it may have joined an earlier cult statue of her mother. The scale of the statue, just under life-size, would fit well in a temple of small dimensions. The only clue as to the identification of the figure is in the appearance. Found within the Demeter sanctuary it could have been a priestess, though according to Waywell the modelling of the body is far too sumptuous for such a representation.⁴⁶ The statue appears to accentuate fertility in its prominent, almost pregnant, stomach. Parallels to this are rare, the best being a statue from the Samos Heraion.⁴⁷ This statue could be a representation of Hera, or one of her priestesses but the swelling of the stomach must symbolize fertility in some way. Kore would then be a pertinent choice for such a figure; a goddess who was associated with childbirth and productivity. For a cult statue it seems extremely small in scale but it is not out of the question that it stood in a shrine to the goddess.

The style of the statue is quite distinct with few parallels, but the general form of the figure resembles the so-called Agora/Dion type of Aphrodite which will be studied in a later section. Similar are the sumptuous modelling of the female form beneath the clinging material of the chiton. A shift of weight enhances the already exaggerated contrapposto, forcing one hip to project and the drapery around the abdomen to stretch and cling. The high girdle and the widely spaced breasts are also a feature of both types, though the carving of the Agora Aphrodite in particular is of a much higher standard.

⁴⁶ Waywell, 1973,94.

⁴⁷ Horn, 1972,81-2, plates 6-9.

This type of Aphrodite is probably to be dated to the first half of the second century B.C. and this may help to date the Knossos Kore and a similar statue now in Taranto. This statue, possibly also representing Kore, is certainly an original of the second century B.C.⁴⁸ The posture, drapery and the form of the two statues reveal that either one is a Hellenistic copy of the other or that they both reproduce some famous original, in which latter case, they were carved not long after the prototype. The Knossos Kore may have been the earlier of the two while the Taranto figure closely copied the figure. The most prominent feature is the swollen abdomen, emphasised by the clinging material of the chiton. This is accentuated even further by the slight backwards shift of the upper body. There are some differences between the two figures in that the himation on the Knossos figure is not drawn as tightly across the legs as on the Taranto statue. The folds on the former lie flatter and the figure has a more conical form as the drapery flares out around the feet. The Taranto figure, however, preserves more of the upper body, particularly the shoulders and the left shoulder which shows a different arrangement of drapery than on the Knossos statue, in that the chiton is exposed rather than being covered with hanging pleats of the himation. On the whole, however, the similarities far outnumber the differences, and in terms of quality both are of fine workmanship and the style and concept is extremely pleasing to the eye.

The Knossos statue certainly seems earlier than either the Kore from Kyzikos or the Amfitrite of Melos but they have a similar, though somewhat less complicated and drier, rendition of the drapery. All these examples show the preference for representing goddesses with the traditional high girdled chiton and himation around the lower body,

⁴⁸ See De Juliis and Lociacano, 1985, no.69.

though in each case the sculptor has carved the figures with an originality of form and design. The pose of the Knossos Kore is stately yet sensuous, rather like the Agora/Dion type, and if we were to restore the Knossos version holding either a torch or a sceptre then the whole figure would have been imposing.⁴⁹ The cult for which the statue may have been dedicated is also not easy to determine. The votive offerings and dedications found at the sanctuary suggest a multifarious cult. Demeter's roles as a goddess of agriculture, fertility and motherhood may have been combined under the general title of "mother earth". Kore's role is as the daughter of Demeter who is taken into the underworld for part of the year and may have been added to the temple when the cult took on a more chthonic character. This is highly speculative and hinges upon whether the statue is in fact the cult image, so the idea should not be stretched too far. The statue, however, is in itself interesting mainly due to the swelling stomach which have been intended to illustrate the aspect of fertility in the cult of the two goddesses.

From the second half of the second century B.C. there is only evidence for two cult images; one of Demeter and the other of Kore.

The Demeter of Eukleides at Boura

Pausanias informs us that Eukleides, a sculptor whose date has recently been challenged through the disassociation of the Aegira head with the sculptor, made several cult images at Boura in Achaia.⁵⁰ The only information that he provides concerning the statue of

⁴⁹ Waywell, 1973,95.

⁵⁰ Pausanias 8,25,9.

Demeter erected in her temple is that it was clothed.⁵¹ A coin from Boura (fig.117) shows a standing, draped goddess which may represent one of the cult images by Eukleides, but whether it is the goddess Eileithyia or Demeter is a problem that has not been resolved. Oikonomides prefers the identification as Eileithyia, the goddess of childbirth, because the pose of the statue with its outstretched arm is similar to representations of that goddess in vase painting.⁵² Stewart identifies the figure as Demeter but is unable to satisfactorily justify his decision.⁵³ Eileithyia often holds an infant in her hands particularly on coinage which may reflect her cult images, whereas on the coin from Boura, the goddess appears to hold a long, cylindrical object in her left hand which could be identified as a torch.⁵⁴ What is interesting is that it may give us some information concerning the style of the sculptor Eukleides. He seemed to have preferred works of slim proportions and a conical design, such as are seen in the mid second century, for example, the Amphitrite of Melos. The poses of the goddess on the coin and of the Amphitrite are almost identical but not of an unusual enough type to suggest the same sculptor or school were involved. It is difficult to compare an image on a coin with that of a marble statue and to make assumptions over sculptors involved, nevertheless the similarity between the Eileithyia and the Amphitrite is convincing and helps us especially in terms of date. This drapery style also appears on female figures on the frieze from the temple of Hekate at Lagina dated to the later second century. The die cutter almost certainly simplified the drapery and so it may have originally been more elaborate than it was depicted, yet whatever the date of Eukleides, this drapery style is so common

⁵¹ See the section concerning the Aphrodite at Boura for discussion on this matter.

⁵² He continues to say that this raised arm gesture was to indicate a smooth course of childbirth, Oikonomides, 1964,88.

⁵³ Stewart, 1979,51.

⁵⁴ See Olmos in LIMC,III, 1986, 685-99, for illustrations of the goddess in vase painting.

throughout the Hellenistic period for goddesses that it is best not to employ it as a dating device.

The interesting point here is that it was a representation of Demeter alone, without her daughter and possibly represented a cult based more on her agricultural role than her chthonic rites. In a historical context, the cities of the Achaean League would have been more able to finance the construction of temples and the dedication of cult images whilst still members of the League. During the latter half of the second century B.C., the original date for Eukleides, the League had dissolved and we should perhaps expect Boura to have been politically and financially weakened after its dissolution. The actual date for Eukleides and the Boura cult image will have to remain a mystery until examples of his work or epigraphical evidence emerge.

The Kyzikos Kore (catalogue number 27), figs. 84-86.

An example of Kore represented and worshipped alone is a single statue of the goddess which was found at Kyzikos in Asia Minor and is of a similar "dry style" to the Amphitrite. Kore was the most revered deity in the city of Kyzikos and worshipped alone, not with her mother. Her cult title was Kore Soteira (the Saviour), and the surviving statue from that city, though without a definite context, is unique and worthy of comment in terms of its style and monumental appearance.

The reliefs on the footstool provide us with a clue as to whom the goddess represents. The decoration consists of pomegranates, an attribute of the Eleusinian goddesses. Of the

two, Kore seems the most appropriate choice, as Hoffmann proposes, as the build of the female form is youthful, not the matronly form usually given to Demeter.⁵⁵ A Hellenistic example of a seated goddess is to be found at Pergamon in a statue of Kybele, with similarity in the design of the himation.⁵⁶ The posture of the two statues, however, is very different, for whilst the Kore is extended and relaxed, the Kybele is quite squat and heavy in her pose. The Kyzikos Kore may perhaps be restored with the left arm raised, the hand holding a long torch or sceptre, as seen in the reconstruction (fig.86). The right hand could possibly be holding a pomegranate but this is hypothetical. The statue may have been placed on a high base and from a low viewpoint the upper torso appears less elongated.⁵⁷ The head was covered with a veil, part of which can still be seen on the shoulders of the goddess. The whole posture and appearance of the statue suggests that it had a cult status rather than the funerary function proposed by Mendel.⁵⁸ The erect posture of the body and upright carriage of the head conforms with the usual appearance of seated cult statues. The original context for this statue is, however, not certain. The pose of the Kore is based upon a traditional design; an upright, seated goddess with a simple and dignified form of drapery. The himation enveloping the middle of the figure is reminiscent of fifth century seated goddesses, particularly the Parthenon pedimental figures, but the style of the Kore certainly is not classicising, while Hasluck proposed that it was designed in imitation of a chryselephantine statue, though he does not explain this proposal.⁵⁹ The overall design of the statue betrays a Hellenistic treatment of the drapery, with its high girdle and elongated proportions and the elaborate

⁵⁵ Hoffmann, 1965,70.

⁵⁶ See Schober 1951, 118 fig 97.

⁵⁷ See Hasluck's photographs of the statue in the BSA volumes 1901-2, plate V -3b.

⁵⁸ Mendel, 1907, III (no.801).

⁵⁹ Hasluck, 1901-2,193-4.

ornamentation of the footstool which seems Hellenistic in its manner. The relationship between the drapery and the torso has much in common with female statues which are second century in design. Two examples are the Kore from Knossos mentioned earlier and the Melian Amphitrite. The manner in which the chiton clings tightly to the waist, hips and swollen stomach is similar on all three statues and the profiles of each form a conical, elongated figure with slim, narrow upper bodies and lower regions swamped in heavy, thick materials which spread out in broader masses. A similar drapery arrangement, style and pose can be found also on a female figure on a Hellenistic grave relief from Priene.⁶⁰ On both the Kore and the seated woman, the short sleeved, highly girt chiton clings tightly to the upper whilst the lower part is draped with an himation which is tucked under the right thigh where it meets the chair. The Priene relief has been dated to the first half of the second century on stylistic grounds but finds parallels in the latter half of the century, the likely date for the Kyzikos statue. This contrast between the thin chiton of the upper torso and the thicker material of the himation around the hips is comparable with early Hellenistic statues and may have been a reaction against the excesses of the mid Hellenistic, elaborate draperies typified by the Great Altar sculptures. This more restrained, yet not dull, arrangement of drapery seems to have been favoured during the later Hellenistic period.

The Kyzikos statue is the most monumental of statues of Kore but is not rigidly frontal and Classical in pose. There is a considerable torsion in her upper torso and the intended viewpoint was probably from a three-quarter angle towards the right side of her body. Whether there was any visual contact between spectator and goddess cannot be ascertained

⁶⁰ Pfuhl and Mobius, 1977, I, 262, no. 1050, plate 157.

without the head, but, as a monumental cult image of the protecting deity of the city, the Kyzikos statue is highly effective. It is a dignified and stately representation of Kore and when viewed from a low angle the elongated appearance is alleviated and the upper torso seems more naturalistic. Thus it seems certainly a cult image of a major goddess, but its original place of display is uncertain.

An analysis of the cult images of Demeter and her daughter during the Hellenistic period has revealed numerous interesting points. Their cults were widespread and of the utmost importance in newly founded cities in Asia Minor, particularly at Pergamon, Miletos, Priene and Kyzikos. Their worship was also promoted on the mainland at Dion, Kallipolis, Lykosoura and Megalopolis. The mystery cults were of extreme importance but it has not been possible to assess the type of cult image utilised in this aspect of their cult, other than that the two were often worshipped together in their chthonic guise. Whether the cult images used in the Mystery cults reflected the Eleusis cult statues is another question which cannot be answered by the existing evidence as the nature of the Eleusis images remains a complete mystery.

The cult images of Asklepios and Hygieia form an important and extensive part of this study, with an abundance of archaeological material bearing witness to the expansion of the cults of the healing deities during the Hellenistic period. Asklepios is not strictly an Olympian deity, but because of his connection with Apollo, whom he superseded as a god of healing, and his status amongst the Greek deities, Asklepios should not be overlooked in such a study. Hygieia is also important as the member of Asklepios' family most frequently represented in the plastic arts. The two deities are well represented amongst the fragments of Hellenistic cult statues, particularly from the Greek mainland and islands. Their cults and temples were important elements of sanctuaries in Asia Minor, but interestingly it is from this region that there are fewer actual remains. Coins again play a major role in assessing the lost cult images, as does the evidence of inscriptions and literary texts. Unusually for cult images of the Greek deities of this period there are several famous masters associated with statues of Asklepios and Hygieia. These include Kephisodotos and Timarchos, Nikeratos, Phyromachos, Damophon, Attalos and Timarchides and Timokles, some of the most distinguished sculptors of the Hellenistic period.

The major difficulty in the study of the iconography of the healing god and his daughter is that there have been very many attempts at establishing a typology of their statue types, particularly those of Asklepios. Furthermore, these categories have not been thorough enough to include any innovations in the representations of the god during the Hellenistic period. Most scholars appear to believe that the image of Asklepios had been established

by the late Classical period and that all later images of the god were derived from a restricted number of prototypes. Bieber attempted to define the origins of certain Hellenistic statues of the god, but over-simplified her arguments, concluding that there were two basic types for the god; a standing type, perhaps first created by Alkamenes in the later fifth century, and the seated type by Thrasymedes at Epidauros of the early fourth century B.C.¹ Recently there have been more attempts to create a typology, in a somewhat more scientific way than that of Bieber. The definitive work should perhaps have been that of Holtzmann in the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologicae Classicae*. This was an ambitious work, but it failed to isolate new Hellenistic types and instead classified images under labels such as seated, standing, leaning and also by the type of head. Borbein successfully criticized this method and proposes that it is difficult to determine how many famous prototypes there were compared to variants or innovative images of Asklepios. He claims that Holtzmann presented a sketchy and schematic survey of the statues.² Another method of categorizing Asklepios types relies too much on drapery arrangement. Meyer with this method groups a great many later copies together under the type of the Asklepios Guistinani, the criteria being the high himation which only reveals the breast and right arm and an almost diaphanous treatment of the material which appears to cling to the body.³ This type has a rigid frontality and Phidian facial features and must be a product of the late fifth or early fourth century. Another typology was created by Kranz who again uses superficial alterations in drapery design to categorize the statues, though he is more successful when it comes to identifying different postures.⁴

¹ Bieber, 1957,73.

² Holtzmann, 1984, 863-897.

³ She dates this type to the early fourth century and this appears correct. The almost diaphanous handling of the material compares well with later fifth and early fourth century drapery styles, particularly the sculptures from Epidauros.

⁴ Kranz, 1989,107-155.

From his work it is apparent that Hellenistic statues of the god tended to have greater movement in their posture. His criteria for selection were an exaggerated *contrapposto* and an inclined head; the degree to which these two features are indicative of Hellenistic Asklepios statues be discussed in more detail below. Each surviving cult image requires individual attention before any attempt at classification is justified.

The problem of dating particular sculptors and of isolating individual cult images from fragments and coin types when more than one temple sometimes stood in a city, such as at Pergamon and Kos, confuses the issue further. Yet it shows the popularity of the deities and the embellishment of their often large sanctuaries.

The Late Classical Forerunners

During the late Classical period many sculptors created statues of Asklepios, a result of the growing number of sanctuaries of the god. The most famous cult image of the god was, of course, the statue at Epidauros by Thrasymedes which was of the seated type. Scholars have attempted to identify copies of this statue amongst seated statues of the god with varied degrees of success, though the original may have been a major influence on the later iconography of the god. The popularity of this type will be analyzed below.⁵ Skopas was responsible for other important cult groups of the healing god and his favourite daughter, at Gortys in Arkadia and at Tegea, probably both to be dated to the mid fourth century.⁶ Again scholars have endeavoured to recover evidence of possible

⁵ For an examination of the original chryselephantine statue by Thrasymedes see Krause, 1972, 240-257.

⁶ Pausanias, Gortys, 8,28,1 and Tegea, 8,47,1.

copies of the groups, though with little success. Bryaxis also made a statue of the god, though it is uncertain whether this was the work of the older or younger sculptor of that name.⁷ In the early Hellenistic period many statues of Asklepios and Hygieia were commissioned for the new sanctuaries in the eastern Greek islands and Asia Minor. Telesinos made a bronze Asklepios for the island of Delos which he financed himself, but it is uncertain whether this was the cult image of the god in the Asklepieion or a votive offering to the god.⁸ The sons of Praxiteles, Timarchos and Kephisodotos, also made a statue of Asklepios which was later to be found in Rome. The significance of these two sculptors and their work at Kos will be discussed shortly. Working slightly later was Nikeratos, an Athenian sculptor who worked for the early Attalid kings in Pergamon, whose bronze statues of Asklepios and Hygieia were also later taken to Rome.⁹ Whether these were cult images inside one of the many temples of the healing deities at Pergamon is uncertain. What is interesting, however, is that it appears to have been famous early Hellenistic master sculptors who were contracted to produce the cult statues and votive images of Asklepios and Hygieia, and often for major sanctuaries.

⁷ This statue was seen and recorded by Pliny in Rome. Pliny NH 34.73.

⁸ For this statue see Stewart, 1990,297 and for the sculptor Telesinos see section on Poseidon and Amphitrite from Tenos.

⁹ For a description of these images see Pliny, NH.34.80.

The Third Century B.C.

First to merit examination are those statues created in the early Hellenistic period, two of which come from important sanctuaries at Corinth and Kos.

The Asklepieion at Corinth

Pausanias informs us that the cult images at Corinth were of marble and represented both Asklepios and Hygieia.¹⁰ Archaeological excavations have revealed that the Asklepieion was enlarged at the end of the fourth century to accommodate the growing popularity of his cult. Little survives of the relatively small temple of the god but there are cuttings in the rock which indicate the form and size of the base. The long narrow base confirms the report of Pausanias that two images stood in the cella of the temple. For further information there are representations of Asklepios and Hygieia on coinage from the city. One particular coin, dating to the reign of Lucius Verus (Fig.118), perhaps reproducing the cult statues from the temple, shows two standing figures: Asklepios on the right leaning on his staff which has a serpent entwined around it, and Hygieia facing her father holding a cornucopia in her left hand and a pitcher in her raised right hand. Asklepios appears in a typical Hellenistic manner with his left hand securing the drapery around his hips, the material of which swathes most of his body except his chest. The torsion of the figure suggests a date in the early Hellenistic period rather than an earlier figure which may have stood in the sanctuary before the late fourth century reconstruction. The drapery of the Hygieia is also Hellenistic, with a high belted chiton worn in the manner of the Themis of

¹⁰ Pausanias, 2,4,5.

Rhamnous, the Kallipolis Persephone and the Amphitrite from Tenos. It seems reasonable that this coin gives a fairly accurate portrayal of the group. We can only surmise that the close relationship between the two deities, as emphasised by their eye contact, was as important as the intimacy between the worshipper and the deities. Beyond this, we know nothing of the group.

The cult images in the Asklepieion at Kos.

Asklepios is the deity most represented on Kos in the archaeological record. His Koan sanctuary ranked alongside those at Pergamon and Epidauros as the most distinguished of all healing sanctuaries. The main period of planning of the Asklepieion was during the period of Ptolemaic control of the island, when the whole complex was designed as an harmonious unit. On the lower terrace, two halls stood on either side of a grand staircase which led up to the middle terrace. The altar stood on this platform which in form was very similar to the Pergamene altar.

The main temple to Asklepios stood on the upper terrace and rose on three carved steps on a stylobate measuring 18.79 x 33.28 metres. The order, with 6 x 11 columns, was Doric, the use of which may have been in emulation of the Asklepieion at Epidauros. A smaller Ionic temple was constructed on a lower terrace. Both temples fortunately preserve the bases for the cult images, the large dimensions of which suggest that there were groups of cult statues rather than single figures of Asklepios. The enhanced reputation of Asklepios on Kos is revealed on coinage where, in the second century B.C., his image replaces that of Herakles on the reverse side. Some coins depict the god alone,

others the god with Hygieia. For this reason, rather than dealing with the two temples and their statues chronologically, the early and high Hellenistic cult groups will be considered together.

Several attempts have been made to distinguish representations of Asklepios and Hygieia on coinage and to assign them to their temples, dated to about 300 - 275 B.C. and to around 160 B.C. Kabus-Preisshofen uses numerous statuettes to reconstruct the original appearance of the groups but relies too much on circumstantial evidence; her opinions will be discussed in more depth shortly.¹¹ Bieber attempted to define the specific types used for the two Hellenistic temples, but, in the process, possibly over-simplified the issue.¹² Instead of seeking possible reproductions of the statue she relied too much on the process of religious conservatism and the dubious concept that new sanctuaries required the cult images to evoke, in their appearance, an earlier and famous prototype. She wrongly assumed that the Koan statues of Asklepios were variants of the standing image by Alkamenes which stood in the Athenian sanctuary of the god. To further narrow the selection down, Bieber used drapery arrangements to determine the early Hellenistic cult statue of the god, citing those copies or coin depictions which have a large overfold of material around the middle of the body. This hypothesis, that there were only a limited number of prototypes, is too simplistic and does not correspond with the archaeological evidence. Excavations at the site have yielded several statuettes which may or may not duplicate one of two cult images, which, however, vary in their appearance and style and may not in fact be of much assistance. Another important potential factor in the

¹¹ Kabus-Preisshofen, 1988,25-65.

¹² Bieber, 1957,85

Hellenistic cult statues at Kos and the coin depictions of the images is that there was probably an earlier, fourth century cult statue of the god on Kos. Kabus Priesshofen suggests that the original may have been a work in the manner of Skopas or a piece in the east Greek style, though she fails to define this ambiguous style. She continues to say that the Melos head and a torso from Kalymnos were workshop reproductions of the Kos statue produced for other healing sanctuaries on the Greek islands.¹³ Given the lack of evidence for late Classical cult image at Kos, the later cult groups require examination.

Kabus-Priesshofen illustrates several statuettes of Asklepios that she proposes may have copied the early Hellenistic cult statue in Temple B. One particular example is noteworthy for its arrangement of the himation and its sweeping, diagonal folds which the author believes were a characteristic of this cult statue.¹⁴ The most prominent feature of the statuette is the shift of weight from a central axis in two directions; the upper body towards the left and the lower body to the right. This has the effect of projecting the right hip and thus the navel appears off centre.¹⁵ This, in effect, creates an optical illusion whereby the right leg seems to bear the weight of the body, but there is also a tension on the left leg as the upper body pushes down upon it. This pose could not conceivably indicate a Classical date for the piece, and must post-date Lysippos, though this alone does not tell us whether the statue reproduced the cult image. To complicate matters further the statuettes differ in style, though this is not evidence enough to claim that they do not copy the same original and may be due to the different dates of their manufacture. The torso of a statuette in Dresden, found in the Asklepieion, is treated in a different manner

¹³ Kabus-Priesshofen, 1988,51.

¹⁴ Kabus-Priesshofen, 1988, fig.1.

¹⁵ This type of posture and displacement of weight is also a feature of the Asklepios of Mounychia.

to that of another example, now in Istanbul.¹⁶ The fleshy surfaces of the former are handled in a manner more in keeping with early Hellenistic styles. The flesh is softer and clings less tautly to the muscles and bone than that of the Istanbul variant. The rendering of the flesh and the languid posture of the god suggests the style of Praxiteles, whose sons are known to have been employed to decorate the altar at Kos, situated directly in front of Temple B and probably of the same date.¹⁷ It is conceivable, but by no means certain, that these two distinguished sculptors, Kephisodotos and Timarchos, may also have carved the cult group. A head of Asklepios found in the sanctuary also reflects the style of these two sculptors, for although it is of Roman date, copies an early Hellenistic original with a distinct sentimentality and an intense pathos which is almost identical to another head, perhaps of Demeter, found on the island.¹⁸ The Asklepios does not necessarily reproduce the early Hellenistic cult image in Temple B, but demonstrates the presence of sculptors working in the style of the late Classical masters such as Praxiteles.

Another example of the somewhat tenuous links employed by Kabus-Priesshofen was her association of the early Hellenistic cult images of Asklepios and Hygieia in Temple B with a statuette group now in Moscow.¹⁹ The god stands on the left of Hygieia, turning his head towards her and rests his right arm on her shoulder. He wears a voluminous himation which covers his entire left shoulder, side and lower body, leaving only the

¹⁶ The Dresden example, Kabus-Preisshofen, 1988, 228-9, plate 1, catalogue number 46; the Istanbul figure, 230-1, plate 3,1, no.48.

¹⁷ The style of these two sculptors may be seen in the fragments of figures found near the Altar at Kos. For a survey of these sculptures see Bieber, 1923-4,242-275.

¹⁸ For the Asklepios see Kabus-Preisshofen, 1988, plate 1,2, catalogue no.88, and the Demeter, plate 21, 3-4, catalogue number 98. The turn of the head, the angle and the action of the eyes gazing upwards are extremely similar to the Asklepios. The style combines post Praxitelean and Skopasian characteristics

¹⁹ See Kabus-Preisshofen, 1988, fig.2. This is of Roman date.

upper torso bare. The himation hangs with a large overfold of material, the type of drapery favoured by Bieber for the Temple B statue of the god.²⁰ He stands with his weight on his left leg whilst his right is relaxed. Hygieia is more frontal in pose, though her missing head may have been gently turned towards the god. Her weight is also carried on her left leg whilst the right is relaxed. She wears a high belted chiton, typical of early Hellenistic goddesses, and an himation which sweeps over her extended left arm. The right arm is carried in a similar manner and is entwined with the serpent. Kranz noted that this type is seen in a headless statue from Gortyn on Crete which has a comparable drapery arrangement and pose and follows either the same prototype or one of the same period.²¹ This analysis is successful in its attempt to recognize early Hellenistic statues of Asklepios and Hygieia but is not that informative in terms of recognising the cult images in Temple B at Kos amongst copies. Furthermore, given the abundance of evidence for the iconography of the two deities in the late Classical and early Hellenistic periods, it is almost impossible to assign particular statues to an individual temple. This problem is exacerbated by the acute similarities between different types of Asklepios statues produced.

A similar situation exists for the cult group in the temple on the upper terrace of the Asklepieion, temple A, probably constructed in the second quarter of the second century B.C. This will be discussed out of chronological sequence because, as with the statues in temple B, we have to use coin types and stylistic comparisons in an attempt to recognize the cult images. The base in this large temple measures 2.50 x 1.30 metres and is thus

²⁰ See Bieber, 1957,85.

²¹ For an illustration of this statue see Colini, 1973-4, plate 80c.

sizable enough to accommodate a group of figures. There have been many attempts to define a copy or coin representation of the cult images but, given the difficulties in isolating particular statues on coins, any identifications must be treated with caution. Despite this, Kabus-Priesshofen claimed that there are at least two copies of the Asklepios and one of Hygieia, who probably stood alongside her father on the base. The first statue, preserved from the waist downwards, was found in the Asklepieion on Kos.²² The figure is draped around the lower hips and lower legs and the fragment preserves a small portion of the naked abdomen. The treatment of the drapery in this Roman work, however, is indistinct and does not appear to be derived from a second century original. The triangular overfold of the himation and the loose bunch of the material around the waist have been noted by the author as comparing well to a statuette of the god in Boston.²³ Here the god stands in a frontal position, draped with an himation over his left shoulder and lower body, in a manner typical for the god. The small scale of the piece, particularly the head, renders stylistic comparisons almost impossible, however, with the facial features, hair and anatomical formation appearing eclectic rather than relating to a specific period in sculpture production. The author cites as a companion piece a statuette in a similarly eclectic style in Vienna. The drapery style of the Hygieia appears early Hellenistic in character and is similar in style to a female statue in Detroit.²⁴ In fact the pair of statuettes utilise early third century drapery devices and facial features rather than mid second century styles. If the two figures do belong together then there would be a better case for assigning them to Temple B.

²² See Kabus-Priesshofen, 1988, plate 9.

²³ Kabus-Priesshofen, 1988, plate 8, nos 1&3.

²⁴ For the Hygieia see Kabus-Priesshofen, 1988, plate 8, nos 2&4. For the Detroit statue see Ridgway, 1990, plate 30.

To find further clues as to the appearance of the Temple A statues we can turn to coinage of the city. One particular coin, issued under Nikostratos, a Koan magistrate of the mid second century B.C., shows a single figure of Asklepios, turning his head to the left and leaning on his staff which has serpents entwined around it.²⁵ The sketchy cutting of the image on the die does not lend itself well to comparisons in the round, but the general scheme of the statue could indeed be second century in design, in particular, the strong articulation of the musculature of the torso. The chest and shoulders are broad and robustly modelled and the style finds parallels in Baroque sculpture of a similar age. The legs, seen through the diaphanous material of the himation, also reveal the massive structure of the figure. Further clues are given in coins which depict the head of an Asklepios from the same period. These reveal a vigorous modelling style with the hair and beard formed out of thick, deeply cut locks, and a modulation of the skin, muscle and bone, which find parallels in heads such as the Trojan Zeus and the giants from the Great Altar Gigantomachy. It is also similar to the head of Asklepios Soter on the coin from Pergamon, a possible representation of the statue by Phyromachos which will be analyzed later in this chapter. There is, however, the possibility that the die cutter re-styled an earlier statue and caused it to appear more contemporary. One scholar has proposed that the original of this leaning type of Asklepios may be traced back to the famous Asklepios by Bryaxis in the later fourth century, and claims further that the Melos head was a slightly earlier example of this type.²⁶ This typifies attempts at the iconography of the god, and reveals the tendencies towards typology rather than the isolation of specific statues and their possible innovative qualities. The single figure of Asklepios was

²⁵ Bieber, 1957, fig.11.

²⁶ Six, 1922,34.

probably part of a group with Hygieia to whom he would be turning, as indicated by the posture and non-frontality of the figure. This close relationship between the parent and daughter, as we have seen between groups of Demeter and Persephone, was an important element in the Healing cults. For the possible Hygieia from temple A there are no obvious reproductions in marble and coins do not really help to define her appearance.

In conclusion there are few obvious later copies from which to gather information about the two cult groups at Kos. For Temple B, the early third century construction, it is possible that the two sculptors, Kephisodotos and Timarchos carved the cult images since they decorated the adjacent altar. One might expect the city to employ prominent sculptors to create the cult statues, but there are no obvious links between these sculptors and the Asklepieion images. For the second century temple, the leaning type of Asklepios, found on contemporary coinage and a popular later Hellenistic type, may have been the cult image with a standing Hygieia who is easily recognizable on coinage or in copies. This complex and problematic analysis will be repeated again when the statues of Asklepios and Hygieia from Pergamene temples are examined. For now, however, there is at least one original marble head of a cult image of Asklepios to investigate, that is the mid third century head from Melos.

The Asklepios of Melos (catalogue number 10), figs. 33-34.

This original marble head, probably to be identified as Asklepios both by its appearance and its findspot, is one of the finest portrayals of the god. It is also one of the most problematic in terms of dating. Suggested dates for the Melos head range from about 330

B.C., with attributions to sculptors such as Skopas and Bryaxis, to the late Hellenistic period. Borbein proposed a first century date for the head and claimed that it is a later example of an eclectic work influenced by fifth and fourth century pieces with a Baroque overworking.²⁷ This will be discussed in more detail below. In more recent works on Greek sculpture there is still confusion as to the most appropriate date for the Asklepios. Stewart follows the traditional late fourth century date and Smith's dating is equivocal, ranging from the third to second centuries B.C.²⁸ This ambiguity and general misunderstanding of the style of the head renders a fresh analysis essential.

Picard's proposed date has been the most interesting so far, as he claims that the work is late Classical in style, but that a later date could also be applied.²⁹ The general appearance of the facial features can best be described as combining a Praxitelean sentiment and Skopasian pathos with a more turbulent modelling of the hair, beard and skin surfaces. These features suggest a date somewhat later than the final quarter of the fourth century. The paradox is that the head has stylistic parallels amongst works dating from the later fourth to the late third centuries B.C. In terms of the origin of the sculptor there is also confusion amongst scholars. An Attic origin has been suggested by Stewart who dates it to the later fourth century, but Kabus-Priesshofen, however, proposed that it could possibly be a workshop reproduction of an earlier fourth century statue of the god which stood in the Asklepieion at Kos. She further claimed that the sculptor was probably influenced by Skopas and worked in an Ionian style.³⁰ Owing to the significant influence

²⁷ For a list of scholars who claim a fourth century dating and attribution to Byraxis see Borbein, 1988,212, n.20.

²⁸ Stewart, 1990,191 and Smith, 1991,64.

²⁹ Picard, 1963,902. Ashmole contemplated a possible later dating but appeared to favour a late Classical origin more strongly.

³⁰ Kabus-Priesshofen, 1988,42.

of Athenian sculptors, such as Praxiteles, on the general form and style of the head, Stewart's proposal seems the most likely. Another important question is whether the head was an innovative image of the god for its day or whether it was derived from an earlier prototype. Pollitt suggested that the style was influenced by Thrasymedes' famous chryselephantine image at Epidauros and that, in general iconographical terms, it reproduced the most famous bearded father deity of all, the Zeus by Phidias at Olympia.³¹ It is important to remember, however, that this cult image was seated and the Melos head is to be restored on a standing body. Bieber claimed that the Melos head adhered to strict criteria for representing the god in a standing position and erroneously compares the piece to the Asklepios from Mounychia. This latter head, however, is most certainly to be dated to the early second century, as we shall see shortly, and shows little in common with the Melian head other than its hairstyle. The angle of the two heads is entirely different and the Mounychia example is Baroque in character, whereas the Melian head is earlier in date. The type of Asklepios used for the Melos Asklepios was probably that of the leaning type. Ashmole notes that when the head is positioned at the correct viewing angle it bows down considerably and is turned to the left somewhat. A statuette of the god, also preserved in the British Museum, shows how the Melos head could be restored to a body.³² The head is of the same type as the Melos example and wears a band around its head in a similar manner. The expression is benevolent and mild and improves greatly from a low angle. To judge from the dimensions of the Melos head the original, standing image must have been over twice life-size, but due to the lack of archaeological evidence, we cannot restore it to a base or temple. An inscription found at *

³¹ Pollitt, 1972,166.

³² See Ashmole, 1951 (2), plate 4c for an illustration of the statuette.

the Asklepieion informs us that Hygieia was also worshipped at the sanctuary and a small statuette of the goddess was recovered during explorations of the site. Both the posture and action of the Asklepios may suggest that he was grouped with a standing image of Hygieia, though this cannot be proven.

The phase to which this head belongs is probably an intermediate one in the development of the Baroque style which according to Stewart, was initiated by Attic sculptors.³³ Like the Boston Demeter, the massive modelling of the head, formed out of several parts (an indication of its Hellenistic dating), and the modelling of the flesh surfaces over underlying features seem to charge the basic forms of Praxiteles with a greater dynamism. The hair in particular, with its so-called royal anastole, and the heavily swollen brow indicate that the sculptor was experienced and resourceful in his craft and did not need to evoke the style of earlier masters for his inspiration. One scholar, however, sees these qualities as classicising rather than innovative traits. In his recent re-evaluation of the Melos Asklepios, Borbein proposes that the date of the head should be lowered into the first century B.C. The only stylistic evidence given by Borbein for the downdating of the Melos head is the differential texture of the locks of hair on the head and those of the beard. He uses the contrast in modelling to parallel the head with that of Menelaos in the so-called Pasquino group, which is a possible late Hellenistic work in a revived Baroque style.³⁴ There is, admittedly, a fine distinction in modelling between the hairs of the

³³ He claims, however, that the style perhaps began later with Phryomachos. Stewart, 1979,11,16-17. Ridgway disagrees with this hypothesis and suggests that Attic sculptors were not responsible for the formation of the style. Ridgway, 1990,374,n.2.

³⁴ Other examples of possible first century date are the Laokoon and the Sperlonga sculptures. Borbein, 1988,217 dates the Pasquino group to this century and Ridgway also agrees that a later date is possible. Ridgway, 1990,278. Other scholars see the Menelaos group as a high Hellenistic creation, Smith, 1991,104-5 dates it between 250 -200 B.C. I am inclined to go for a high Hellenistic date but later than Smith's - the most appropriate period would be between 200-150 B.C.

beard and head, which contrasts effectively with the gently undulating skin tones. There are no sharp lines on the head at all and even the relatively straight line of the brow is more curved than that of the most similar piece, the Zeus of Otricoli. The Melos Asklepios is of superb quality with its sculptor being amongst the finest and most proficient of all early Hellenistic sculptors, and one who contributed to the development of the Baroque style. The sculptor is, however, unfortunately unknown and the sanctuary, though of importance to the island, was not sufficiently well known enough to have been recorded in historical texts. This, and the lack of published information concerning the Asklepieion on Melos, makes it difficult to restore the cult image to its original context.

Thus we have our finest early Hellenistic cult image of the god and its importance lies partly in the fact that such a small island as Melos, which is not known historically for its production of sculpture, could have employed such a first rate master to produce their cult image of Asklepios. Iconographically, it can be compared to many of the standing statues of the god in a similar position, though it is the finest and not an eclectic Roman creation which many of the later variants may well be. This phase of the early Hellenistic styles progresses further in the Asklepios by Phyromachos, preserved not in its original, but rather in literary evidence and coin depictions.

Phyromachos' statue in the Asklepieion at Pergamon

In the city of Pergamon there was one large sanctuary dedicated to the gods of Healing and several other small temples throughout the city that were, in all likelihood, dedicated to Asklepios and his family. We know of at least one group of Asklepios and Hygieia

which was the work of Nikeratos, mentioned earlier, and the better known Asklepios by Phyromachos, who may have either been a pupil or son of Nikeratos. Nikeratos and Phyromachos are known to have collaborated on several monuments on Delos and at Pergamon and other locations in Asia Minor, and as such clearly indicate the shift of employment for sculptors to eastern Aegean cities during the early Hellenistic period. Where the group by Nikeratos stood in Pergamon is unclear, with the only evidence for the original context of the cult group being the remains of a small temple in the Asklepieion sanctuary which is probably to be dated between 250 - 225 B.C. From evidence of coinage we see that the earliest type of Asklepios used on currency was a seated statue. The problem is that it is not clear whether this represented an actual cult image in a temple, perhaps the statue of the god by Nikeratos, or whether the die cutter used chose a generic Asklepios type to suggest that the cult existed in that city and had a longer history - an obvious prototype would then be the Asklepios by Thrasymedes. Unfortunately the issue is not quite so simple and Andrae believes that the seated statue on coinage is the Asklepios by Phyromachos.³⁵ Generally, however, it is agreed that this sculptor created a standing image of the god which was depicted on coinage in the second century B.C. and continued being represented throughout antiquity. It is the image by Phyromachos which is the most clearly documented and so it will be discussed in more detail.

One of the major problems concerning the sculptor Phyromachos is the date of his career. Traditionally his floruit has been located in the middle of the third century B.C. Indeed Pliny mentions him as one of the few early Hellenistic sculptors worthy of attention,

³⁵ Andrae, 1990,75.

providing a date, though somewhat too early, of 296-292 B.C.³⁶ Epigraphic evidence, * though not always trustworthy, would place Nikeratos within the middle of the century and this sculptor and Phyromachos are known to have been commissioned by a king Attalos.³⁷ That the commission was the Gaulish Victory monuments suggests that this was for Attalos I. The dates of Phyromachos rest not only on his collaboration with Nikeratos and the chronology of the Attalid dedications both in Pergamon and Athens, but also on his other known works, particularly his portrait of Antisthenes. Using this evidence, Andreae has recently challenged the third century date for the sculptor and claimed that the Asklepios was created in the second quarter of the second century B.C., more exactly in the years 167-156 B.C.³⁸ This date is clearly too late and his choice of statue, deduced from coinage, is also probably inaccurate and so the arguments require considerable attention if we are to understand the style of the sculptor and the appearance of his cult image. The question of where this image stood will be discussed below.

Most scholars agree that Phyromachos was at his most active between 230 - 200 B.C.³⁹

His relationship with the Attalid Victory monuments is attested in literary and epigraphic * evidence and if the copies of the Antisthenes reproduce his posthumous portrait, they resemble in style the giants of the smaller Attalid dedication. The style of the Antisthenes is thoroughly Baroque in character with a vigorous modelling of the facial features which

³⁶ Pliny, NH, 34,51.

³⁷ The style of lettering on bases found at Delos and at Pergamon, bearing the names Phyromachos and Nikeratos seem to date to the third century B.C. and probably to the reign of Attalos I.

³⁸ See Andreae, 1990, 45-99.

³⁹ The arguments concerning the date of the works for Attalid kings depends on that of the Attalid dedications in Athens. Queyrel, 1989, 286 believes that these date to the reign of Attalos I. Ridgway, 1990, 301 claims that both the small dedication on the Acropolis at Athens and the Antisthenes portrait date to the later years of the third century B.C. Stewart, 1979, 16-17 also agrees with the traditional dating for Phyromachos' career.

have a craggy feel about them. The furrowed brow, heavily lidded eyes and dishevelled hair find parallels amongst the copies of the giants from the Athenian Attalid dedication. There is no time here to discuss the date of the groups on the Acropolis, but it is clear by their style that they are near contemporaries of the larger Gauls which date to the period 250 - 230 B.C. The Antisthenes could well belong to the early second century B.C., but the evidence for Phyromachos' location in the third century appears stronger than for in the mid second century. It is possible also that the Antisthenes was a late work of Phyromachos whose career may well have extended into the early years of the following century, but his upper date is undetermined.

The main arguments for the lowering of the dates of Phyromachos are stylistic rather than archaeological or literary. Andrae's strong determination that the head of a bearded god found at Syracuse is an Augustan copy of Phyromachos' Asklepios, is his main argument for a re-dating of the sculptor.⁴⁰ This colossal head represents a heavily bearded god in a style contemporary with the Gigantomachy at Pergamon. It is Baroque at its most mature and dynamic and the treatment of the hair, beard and facial features betray a sculptor who has witnessed or even worked upon the Pergamene Gigantomachy. The expression is intense and the features animated, perhaps too overtly agitated to be part of a cult image. Even its closest counterpart, the Trojan Zeus, is a calmer portrayal of a deity of the same period in sculpture. Andrae argues that the Syracuse head is to be identified as a copy of Phyromachos' work because of its similarity with the head of Asklepios Soter on Attalid coinage. This coin (fig. 120), dated to the second century B.C., has a powerfully modelled head of the healing god in profile which reveals a Baroque style in the treatment

⁴⁰ Andrae, 1990, plates 20-35.

of hair, beard and skin surfaces. The facial features certainly appear animated, but not to the extent of the Syracuse head. If this coin image does reproduce Phyromachos' work, and it may instead copy the cult image of Asklepios Soter placed in another temple, then it reveals the sculptor's familiarity with the newest techniques.

To return to the Syracuse head, this seems different to the usually calm representations of deities in a religious setting, and the head would perhaps be better restored to a Baroque group. This is speculative but there is no proof that the head even represents a deity, let alone Asklepios who is usually portrayed in a slightly more benevolent manner. The treatment of the head certainly generates the dynamic, theatrical qualities more suited to an assemblage of figures than a single cult image. If we are to locate the entire figure by Phyromachos on coinage then we must perhaps look for a standing image rather than the seated one preferred by Andreae which as we have already noted is an earlier Pergamene type.

The other frequently used image of Asklepios on coins from the city is a standing statue, frontal in pose and leaning on a staff, sometimes shown standing within a temple (fig.119).⁴¹ The god wears an himation over his lower body and he carries a staff encircled by a serpent in his lowered right hand. This is a popular type used for statues of the god and one of the closest parallels is to be found in a marble statuette in Herakleion on Crete.⁴² That the type of body used is a common example of Asklepios' iconography is obvious, but what is clearly different at Pergamon is the massive construction of the

⁴¹ This is the type preferred by Stewart for the statue by Phyromachos, see Stewart, 1979, plate 7.

⁴² For the Herakleion figure see Kranz, 1989 (2), fig.4

head, the powerful breast muscles and the dynamic treatment of the hair and beard. The head is large in proportion to the body and the hair long and slightly unruly, hanging low over the face in the so-called royal anastole. The beard is thick and long and similar to the Asklepios Soter on coinage. If the coins are at all faithful to the original then the sculptor was one who could create Baroque and powerful images, yet furnish them with the dignity and divine quality that we see later in the Asklepios from Mounychia and the Trojan Zeus. This sculptor could indeed be Phyromachos, the creator of the Antisthenes, and may be one of his late works, possibly dating between the years 210 - 200 B.C. which seems a reasonable lower date for his career. But what remains is to identify a temple in which the statue stood.

Andreae claimed that the statue was seated and that the colossal Syrakuse head was a reproduction on the same scale as the original. He proposed that such a statue, restored to a height of 3.12 metres, could not easily be accommodated in any of the two Hellenistic temples in the Asklepieion.⁴³ The problem is that, if the statue was a standing image, the two Hellenistic temples appear too small unless this statue was just over life-size.

Stewart, however, proposes that the statue stood in the small Ionic temple on a rocky platform of the sanctuary.⁴⁴ This is possible, but the confusion rests with historical fact rather than archaeological considerations. Polybius informs us that when Prousius of Bithynia sacked the Nikephorion at Pergamon, as yet not archaeologically identified, he removed the Asklepios by Phyromachos as booty.⁴⁵ It was later returned by order of the

⁴³ Andreae, 1990, 85.

⁴⁴ Stewart, 1979, 14. This temple is dated to the early years of the second century B.C. but replaced an earlier third century building. Stewart suggests that Phyromachos' statue was re-dedicated in the later temple.

⁴⁵ Polybius, 32, 27.

Romans, hence its continued use on coins of the city. The text of Polybius is perhaps misleading here, but we do know that several temples stood within the Nikephorion precinct and it is feasible that one of these was dedicated to Asklepios.⁴⁶ Wherever the original location of Phyromachos' Asklepios was, it was an important and famous cult image in its time and one that has possibly been preserved on coins, but not so clearly recognised amongst marble reproductions. The type used was possibly influenced by earlier standing statues of the god, but was not necessarily a direct imitation of Alkamenes standing image in Athens as proposed by Bieber.⁴⁷ Kranz believes that the type was standard for the Hellenistic period, though perhaps does not recognize the more Baroque treatment of the figure.⁴⁸ Both Deubner and Ohlemutz believed that the Pergamene statue reproduced the type of statue known as the Asklepios Giustini, but this is clearly an early fourth century model and probably only distantly related in style to the statue by Phyromachos.⁴⁹ Stewart is perhaps closer to the truth as he claims that the statue is not Classical in style, but completely Hellenistic in character.⁵⁰

In conclusion it appears that Andraea's attempt to downdate the career of the sculptor, and consequently the statue of Asklepios, is not successful, mainly because he relies too much on the Syracuse head for his evidence. It is perhaps clear from coins that Phyromachos' statue was in a Baroque style, but not as advanced as that of the Syracuse head or the Gigantomachy from Pergamon. For a later example of a Baroque statue of Asklepios at

⁴⁶ This is the location that Andraea prefers but only because he is looking for a temple large enough to accommodate his reconstructed, colossal seated statue.

⁴⁷ Bieber, 1957,75.

⁴⁸ Kranz, 1989,130.

⁴⁹ For the views of these two scholars see, De Lucca, 1990,25. For a discussion of the Asklepios Giustini type see Meyer, 1988,119-159.

⁵⁰ Stewart, 1979,6.

Pergamon we must go into the second century where two original fragments of cult images of the god survive, one from the Gymnasion temple at Pergamon and the Asklepios from Mounychia.

The Second Century B.C.

During the second century B.C. the cult of Asklepios and other healing deities grew in popularity and, as a consequence of this, there is more archaeological material than survives from the previous century. The cult images during this century were not as celebrated or important as those third century examples from Pergamon or Kos, but more original fragments survive, particularly from sanctuaries on the mainland of Greece. Another interesting factor is that several of the original pieces can be associated with known sculptors, and coin images preserve some of those which have not survived.

The Mounychia Asklepios (catalogue number 11), figs 35-38

One of the finest portrayals of Asklepios, preserved in an original Hellenistic marble fragment, is the Asklepios from Mounychia. It is also one of the most neglected sculptures from this period, though one of the most interesting. In the most ambitious analysis of Hellenistic sculpture, by Bieber, the statue is virtually ignored and is only mentioned as being in the same general style and type as the Asklepios head from Melos.⁵¹ In a more recent work, Smith only remarks upon the work momentarily and

⁵¹ Bieber, 1961,161.

assigns a broad third to second century date to the piece.⁵² In earlier years the statue had been considered fourth century in date and the names of Skopas and his school were cited as possible creators of the image.⁵³ In his analysis of the sculptor Skopas, Stewart mentions the Asklepios, but rejects the late Classical date in favour of a Hellenistic one.⁵⁴ His arguments are vindicated by the fact that the statue was constructed out of several separately carved pieces and then joined with iron dowels. Other Hellenistic features are the roughly carved rear portions of the figure, the back being treated in a sketchy, roughed out fashion, and the hair not being finished in the round in areas which would not obviously be seen when it was set up in its shrine. Obvious Hellenistic parallels, in this respect, are the large Themis from Rhamnous, the sculptures by Damophon and the Poseidon from Melos, all of which must have been erected close to a cella wall and therefore the rears of the statues would not have been visible. The problem with the Mounychia example is that the sanctuary in which it was found, has not been published, nor was the site systematically excavated and so there is little archaeological evidence to determine the original setting of the statue. Yet the carving is of excellent quality and the facial features are benevolent, mild and compassionate, which is suitable for the god of healing. A closer stylistic analysis of the statue is necessary in order to locate a closer dating for the piece.

The only archaeological evidence that may help us obtain a date for the piece is the form of the sanctuary in which it stood. Stewart has observed a similarity between the forms of

⁵² Smith, 1991, fig.67.

⁵³ Wolters, 1892, compares the statue to the Melian head and claims that the Mounychia example is typical of fourth century representations of the god. Becatti, 1941, 48, also proposes a fourth century date and assigns it to the school of Skopas. See Stewart, 1979,48 for a list of scholars who date the work to different periods.

⁵⁴ Stewart, 1977,78.

the colonnades around the temple at Mounychia and those at the Asklepieion at Messene.⁵⁵ From this observation he has suggested a second century date for the sanctuary and subsequently the cult image. Stewart also notes that the Piraeus enjoyed a revival in economic prosperity during the second century B.C., possibly due to Athens' renewed fortune, and thus we can perhaps expect a renewal of building activity and the Asklepieion was conceivably a product of the rekindled economy. In terms of the style of carving and the pose of the Asklepios, it also appears Hellenistic, and more accurately second century in date.

In the series of Asklepios statues, the Mounychia example continues and exaggerates the "leaning type", the muscles of the torso and raised right shoulder indicate such an action. The facial features also intensify the pathos and compassion seen in earlier Hellenistic statues of the god, such as the Melian head. These features have more in common with works carved in the Baroque style at its peak, than with the sculptures usually associated with the Asklepios. The figure has most often been compared to the Dionysos from Aegira, the Anytos by Damophon and the Poseidon of Melos, but both Lawrence and Becatti claimed that the Anytos by Damophon was more blatantly Baroque in character than the Asklepios. This is peculiar because they both consider the Anytos to be a mixture of both classicising and Baroque; thus their comments imply that the Mounychia statue is even more Classical in form than Damophon's work.⁵⁶ Now that the misleading category of second century neo-classicists has hopefully been eliminated as a possible stylistic trend, the Asklepios must be viewed as a mainland Baroque work of the early

⁵⁵ Stewart, 1979,48.

⁵⁶ Lawrence, 1927,121; Becatti, 1940,48-49.

second century B.C., rather than a late Classical work or a classicising mid-second century piece. Its parallels are greatest amongst eastern Greek works and it may well have been the product of a sculptor who returned to Attica from Asia Minor or the eastern Aegean.

The stylistic observations by Stewart are the most interesting made by scholars. He contrasts the piece with the Dionysos from Aegira and stresses the impressionistic treatment of the hair and skin surfaces on the Asklepios, compared to the clear cut contours and sharply defined features of the Achaean piece. A detailed inspection of the eyes on each head shows a remarkable difference. Those of the Asklepios are positioned further apart than the eyes of the Dionysos and the upper lids are shorter and raised up more than the flatter and more sharply cut eyelids of the head from Aegira. If the eyes had retained their inlay then the Asklepios would appear less severe and intense in expression than the later Dionysos. The lips also show an acute contrast. On the Asklepios they are formed from softer, more rounded contours whereas, those of the Dionysos are clearly defined and flatter in relief. In fact the head from Aegira is more Classical in form. The Anytos by Damophon is a work in a similar vein as the Asklepios, but carved in a slightly less dynamic manner. The hair of the Asklepios owes more to works dated to the early second century B.C. and has parallels at Pergamon and other cities in Asia Minor. Obviously the hairstyle is similar to the Zeus from Otricoli and the Asklepios from Melos, but on the Mounychia head, the locks of hair cling more closely to the face.

One of the most convincing parallels is with the head of Zeus from Troy, dated to the period of the Gigantomachy's production at Pergamon, between about 190 - 160 B.C. The

treatment of the hair is extremely close on both examples, with each lock lying close to the side of the face and deeply undercut with the effect of framing the smooth portions of the flesh with darker shadowy curls. In profile the two heads compare well also, with the eyes deeply set with short lower lids. Both heads reveal Baroque tendencies though the extremes of the style have been moderated for these cult images of bearded father deities. A figure which follows these same specifications is a small statue, perhaps of Poseidon from Pergamon.⁵⁷ The rather lank and soft treatment of the individual locks is a tendency in all three figures and they may be contemporary. The Pergamene statue is different in its temperament, the facial features conveying a more serene expression, particularly emphasized by the lightly closing eyelids.

The torsos of the Asklepios and the Poseidon also compare favourably in terms of style. The figures have a well developed physique, but the modelling of the skin is quite fleshy. The subtle transitions between the skin over the breast and abdomen are unlike the more distinct articulation of the giants and gods on the Gigantomachy from Pergamon, but this suits the quietly standing subjects and is not an indication of a different date. Closer still is a headless torso, probably of Asklepios, from Kos, which Kabus-Preisshofen dates to the period 180-170 B.C., that is roughly contemporary with the Mounychia statue.⁵⁸ In terms of posture, the two figures are extremely similar in the leaning attitude which almost dislocates the upper torso from the draped lower part. The Koan statue exaggerates the lean even further. The preserved portions of drapery on this figure also help to restore the himation worn by the Mounychia statue. The main difference between the two figures is

⁵⁷ See the section on the Zeus from Troy for this statue.

⁵⁸ Kabus-Preisshofen, 1989, plate 41, no 24.

the style and treatment of the skin surfaces and drapery. Firstly the Koan statue is of inferior workmanship, which is evident in the rendering of the pleats of the himation that are flat and dull in their execution. The torso is also different, with weaker musculature and softer skin, particularly around the hips and abdomen. In fact the statue appears post-Praxitelean in design and style and there may well be a case for dating this statue in the early third century rather than in the second.

The attitude of the Asklepios of Mounychia may owe something to Skopas, in terms of its uplifted head and pathetic expression, but its Hellenistic sculptor has created a new and dynamic image of the god which has the general attitude of leaning on a staff, one which the roughly contemporary statue of the god in Temple A on Kos possessed, if the coins from that city are faithful.⁵⁹ The remains of the himation cover part of his back, his left shoulder and also the buttocks, and the flat panel of roughed out marble on his left side reveals that the garment also covered his entire left flank. The naked torso would have been positioned into a draped lower portion. A recently published torso from Cosa was constructed in a similar manner with the left side having a flat, worked section for the attachment of the himation.⁶⁰ The drapery on this figure covers more of the chest, however, but is otherwise close in style to the Mounychia figure, particularly in its contrapposto. The movement of the muscles of the abdomen suggest that the whole figure was almost dislocated in its torsion, another indication of its Hellenistic date. Thus the whole figure would have appeared frontal, but with a distinct shift towards the left. Whether a figure of Hygieia stood beside the god is uncertain and not easy to determine

⁵⁹ See earlier comments upon the high Hellenistic cult image of Asklepios at Kos.

⁶⁰ Collins-Clinton, 1993,257-278.

from the archaeological evidence of the temple, as no base survives to indicate the presence of another cult figure.

This cult image is our most complete example of a Hellenistic Asklepios, and is one of the most impressive of all preserved Hellenistic cult statues. The date of the piece must be somewhere in the first half of the second century B.C., as it compares well with the Gigantomachy from Pergamon and the Trojan Zeus. The head, however, is difficult to parallel amongst extant works and stands as a fine example of the way in which the Baroque style was moderated for cult images. The style is not, however, a mixture of Baroque and classicising as Stewart proposes.⁶¹ The figure has no obvious Classical features whatsoever. The fact that it was made for a sanctuary in Attica demonstrates how sculptors who had worked in Asia Minor, perhaps at Pergamon, also had the opportunity to work on mainland Greece. Compared to other sculptures of this period from the Peloponnese, which exhibit the influence of the Baroque style, the Asklepios exerts a greater dynamism and theatrical quality which results in a powerful image of the Healing god

Asklepios in Temple R at Pergamon (catalogue number 12), fig. 39.

A colossal male torso from a seated statue is the only remnant of the cult image of Asklepios from temple R, which is situated on the Gymnasion terrace at Pergamon. On first publication the fragment was described as coming from an enthroned god with his left

⁶¹ Stewart, 1979,50.

arm raised, holding a sceptre and the right arm lowered.⁶² Given the findspot of the torso and the dedication of the Gymnasion temple to the Healing deities, there is no reason to believe that the torso does not come from the cult image. Because of the divergence of opinions as to whom the temple was dedicated, a short examination of the archaeological evidence seems essential. Ohlemutz noted the finding of several small terracotta statuettes which were dedicated to the healing god in the area.⁶³ Also relevant here are the inscriptions listing the Ephebes of the Gymnasion which suggest that Asklepios was the Gymnasiarch. It would not be surprising to find a shrine of the healing deities in a Gymnasion; in fact it would probably have been considered necessary as the god watched over both youth and health in this temple. In terms of the actual fragment of the cult image itself, the form of the musculature and the heroic nudity could indeed represent any of the male, Olympian gods. Jacobsthal claimed that the torso belonged to the cult image of Asklepios Soter, but Radt has recently doubted such an attribution but does not state his reasons clearly.⁶⁴ The archaeological evidence, however, points towards the identification of Asklepios as the most appropriate.

The date of the temple has been isolated to the second century B.C. and it has an interesting mixture of Ionic and Doric elements. Schwandner compared its architectural features with those of temples by Hermogenes and concluded that the technique of construction was similar to other Pergamene buildings constructed during the reign of Eumenes II.⁶⁵ The temple was first constructed in the Doric order during the later third

⁶² Jacobsthal, 1908,421.

⁶³ Ohlemutz, 1968,128-9.

⁶⁴ Jacobsthal, 1908,421; Radt, 1988,150.

⁶⁵ Schwandner, 1990,85-6.

century B.C., then rebuilt in the second century as an Ionic building, but at what stage the cult image was installed is unclear. It has already been noted how difficult it is to specifically date sculptures, particularly from western Asia Minor contexts, between the last quarter of the third and the first half of the second century B.C., but a close examination of the torso may provide further clues as to its date.

One interesting parallel is the Copenhagen Asklepios, mentioned in the section concerning the Getty Zeus, which is a seated statue with the left arm raised and perhaps reproducing a cult image of the first half of the second century B.C. It compares well to the Pergamon torso in its musculature, which is modelled in a powerful manner around the breast, but the folds of looser skin around the stomach are compressed because the figure leans forwards. The quality of carving of the Asklepios from Pergamon is far superior to that of the later copy, but it must have belonged to a similarly positioned image. This copy also helps us to restore the draped areas to the Pergamon Asklepios, as the flat, worked panel on his back, shows that an himation was added separately, probably in a similar arrangement to the Copenhagen Asklepios.

Because of this relationship, the Asklepios from Pergamon bears a striking resemblance to the Getty Zeus, as the treatment of the male physique is comparable, the rounded and taut pectoral muscles being a prominent feature of both statues. This is enhanced by the pulling of the shoulder muscles of the outstretched left arm. Jacobsthal compares the formation and strength of the musculature with that of the male figures on the Gigantomachy frieze, but these latter examples have a far more pronounced and exaggerated musculature because of their vigorous and active poses. The whole effect of

the musculature of the Asklepios is enhanced by the small indentation in the centre of the breast. This unusual feature is not highlighted to such a degree on any other of the seated male deities of this type and marks a greater understanding of anatomy than the later variants: in fact the entire figure is rendered with a meticulous attention to anatomical detail. The figure could date from the later third century, but has more parallels with sculpture produced in the first half of the second century B.C. The temple in which it was dedicated does not help us establish a precise date, so there is no certainty as to its time of manufacture.

The importance of this piece is that it shows Asklepios and his cult being a central part of a Gymnasion complex, alongside the temples of deities more common in such complexes, such as Herakles and Hermes. What is even more significant is that the remains of the cult statue base in the temple suggest that several figures stood beside the seated god within the cella. The base filled the entire length of the rear wall of the cella, measuring 6.75 metres in length and 2.00 metres deep. On the central portion, which projected out a further 0.80 metres, we can perhaps restore the enthroned statue of Asklepios, and on either side there was possibly a standing figure, either two of the sons of Asklepios or perhaps Hygieia and her mother Epione.⁶⁶ In the small cella, the group would have had an overwhelming presence; the figure of Asklepios alone, if reconstructed, would have been larger than the Getty Zeus, approximately 3.00 metres in height, and it would have dominated the room. It is our only fragment of a certainly seated statue of the god from

⁶⁶ Dörpfeld, 1908,352, noted the similarity in form between the base in this temple and that at Lykosoura. This seems irrelevant and is not an indication of date for the Pergamene cult base. Radt, 1988,149, believes that the supplementary figures may have been priests or that the base carried votive offerings. Because he is not convinced that the temple was dedicated to Asklepios, his proposals are largely irrelevant here.

the Hellenistic period, but fortunately the Copenhagen statue may help us to restore the original impression of the cult image of Asklepios in this temple.

With the cult images of Asklepios and Hygieia from the remainder of the second century we are more fortunate in that they were the works of recorded master sculptors. All of the examples were dedicated in temples on Mainland Greece. Contemporary with both the Asklepios from Mounychia and the Pergamene Asklepios are the two cult groups by Damophon. These two commissions cannot be determined chronologically, but were both for temples in the Peloponnese, firstly at Aegion and secondly at Messene.

The Asklepios and Hygieia at Aegion by Damophon

Only two sources exist that can help us to restore the lost cult statues of Asklepios and Hygieia at Aegion in Achaea. The first is Pausanias who informs us that Damophon created the cult group, but unfortunately he does not describe the images.⁶⁷ There are, however, several coins which appear to reproduce figures of Asklepios and his daughter, either as a pair or individually. Imhoof-Blumer proposed that three coins in particular, dating to the reigns of Commodus and Septimius Severus, reproduce Damophon's group.⁶⁸ The coins showing the individual figures are better preserved and convey the clearest information relating to Damophon's cult statues. The Asklepios is enthroned, holding a staff in his raised right hand whilst his left hand rests on his lap. He wears an

⁶⁷ Pausanias, 7,3,5.

⁶⁸ Imhoof-Blumer, 1964,84-5. The single figure of Asklepios illustrated in figure RIX, is in Berlin and dates to the reign of Commodus. The single Hygieia RX, on a coin at Loebekke, dates to Septimius Severus' reign, the group on fig. RXI, in Paris also dates to Commodus' reign.

himation, which is draped over his right shoulder and hangs at this side of his body before covering the legs. The coin may not be totally trustworthy, but the god appears to have shoulder length hair and a full, but not long, beard. His head is erect and turns towards Hygieia, who is standing with the weight on her left leg and has her right arm outstretched, pointing towards a small pillar with serpents wrapped around it. She wears a long, girdled chiton, the material of which appears thick and grooved, perhaps indicating that the garment was pleated and of a wrinkly texture. Over her lower body and left shoulder there is an additional garment, which also hangs in a large mass of rounded folds to her side. Her head is turned towards her father, but the facial features are not clear on such a small scale.

To attempt to distinguish the style of the statues from these coin representations would be pointless, as they cannot tell us anything more than the general form of the cult images. What is important is that the group of Asklepios and Hygieia was deemed significant enough to be reproduced on coinage. What is also interesting is that Damophon used a seated type for the god, but how far he was influenced by the chryselephantine image at Epidauros is impossible to ascertain. At Epidauros, however, the enthroned deity was probably portrayed without Hygieia and was therefore presumably frontal in pose. In contrast, at Aegion Damophon created a group which possessed a close psychological relationship between Asklepios and his daughter; they are turning towards each other and not the spectator, and the focus of the group appears to have been the pillar with the sacred snakes of the healing deities. Whatever the actual style of Damophon's work here the group, as it appears on coinage, seems impressive in its unity and relationship between the two deities.

The cult statues in the Asklepieion at Messene by Damophon

For the second of Damophon's cult commissions in the Peloponnese in the city of Messene, where this sculptor appears to have enjoyed the monopoly for creating cult images, we must again rely upon Pausanias and coins for evidence. Themelis has recently assigned a group of marble fragments to the himation of Damophon's Asklepios, which he believes stood in the north stoa in room H.⁶⁹ The author claims that Damophon's hand can be seen in the workmanship of the pieces, but, on the whole, they are too small and fragmentary to compare with other pieces by the sculptor. Pausanias tells us that, apart from the many other statues by Damophon in the city, there were images of Asklepios and his children.⁷⁰ The text does not specify, however, whether these were the cult images in the second century temple in the centre of the sanctuary. That they were the cult statues is perhaps likely because of two factors; firstly Damophon was employed to carve most of the city's cult images, and secondly, such a large group of figures, showing Asklepios and his family would require a large building in which to be accommodated.

What was once thought to be the Hellenistic Agora at Messene is now believed to be the sanctuary of Asklepios. Colonnades surround a court which consists of Ionic column bases with Corinthian capitals. The whole complex is 69.0 metres squared, and the temple in the centre is of the Doric order with a peripteros of 6 x 12 columns and the stylobate measures 13.6 x 27.9 metres. The whole construction technique reveals excellent workmanship. Unfortunately there is not enough of the ground plan of the temple

⁶⁹ Themelis, 1993, 30-31, plate 7,5&6.

⁷⁰ Pausanias, 4,31,6-10.

remaining to reconstruct the dimensions of the cult statue base, therefore it is difficult to determine how many figures stood within the cella. The size of the cella and the temple, however, are sufficiently large to house a group of figures of considerable size.

Damophon's cult figures at Lykosoura indicate the sculptor's proficiency in carving colossal figures and there is no reason to suppose that Asklepios was not shown with at least Hygieia, and it is more likely that other members of his family were also represented in the cult group.

Coins from the city show only Asklepios and Hygieia, who were perhaps the two central figures of the group. Asklepios is shown standing alone on one particular coin (fig.121) with his head turned sharply to his right, standing with the weight on his left leg and lowering both arms, the right holding a staff with a serpent coiled around it and the left securing his drapery on his left hip. He wears an himation which covers his legs and left shoulder. He raises his head slightly, perhaps indicating the presence of another figure to his right. Bieber suggested that Damophon took his inspiration from the standing image by Alkamenes in Athens and that it adhered much more to the Classical original than other supposed Hellenistic versions of this same original.⁷¹ The problem here is that the author believes firmly that Damophon belonged to the neo-classicists of the second century B.C., but as we have already established, this term is unacceptable for sculptors of this period. In conclusion the group by Damophon has been irrevocably lost to us and coins can only hint at the visual impact of the group. We know that the sculptor was influenced by the Baroque style, which is evident from the remains of the Lykosura cult statues, but he had also developed his own individual mannerisms which were obviously

⁷¹ Bieber, 1957,77.

suited to the medium of cult images, hence his permanent employment throughout cities in the Peloponnese in creating religious sculpture.

The Asklepios at Elateia by Timokles and Timarchides.

Pausanias is again the only source concerning the cult image of Asklepios at Elateia. He informs us that the cult statue had a beard and was the work of the sculptors Timokles and Timarchides.⁷² The date and style of these two members of the same family of sculptors is analysed in more detail in the section concerning the Athena Krania from the same city, but unlike the case for Athena where coins from the city appear to have reproduced the statue, for Asklepios there is no information other than that given by Pausanias. Luckily other later Hellenistic cult statues in the mainland sanctuaries of Asklepios, with cult images by known sculptors, are slightly better documented.

The Asklepios and Hygieia at Argos by Xenophilos and Stratos

Pausanias informs us that the cult images in the most prominent Asklepieion at Argos were the work of the sculptors Xenophilos and Stratos.⁷³ These sculptors are otherwise only known through inscriptions bearing their names from Epidauros, Tiryns, Kleonai and Sikyon, and they perhaps originated from this area in which they seemed to work. From * the epigraphic evidence alone, the sculptors have been dated to both the end of the third century B.C. by Imhoof Blumer and to the second century by Levi.⁷⁴ Marcadé dates the

⁷² Pausanias, 10,34,6.

⁷³ Pausanias,

⁷⁴ Imhoof-Blumer 1964,60 and Levi, 1971,185, note 138.

* sculptors to the last quarter of the second century on epigraphic grounds, but their exact dates remain a mystery.⁷⁵ Because of the rather unreliable and controversial nature of dating inscriptions from the forms of the letters, it is difficult to precisely date the careers of the two sculptors. Pausanias only tells us that the cult group was made out of marble, with Asklepios seated and Hygieia standing. An interesting and uncommon fact, however, is that the sculptors dedicated statues of themselves to the god, and this may reflect the importance of these sculptors in their day and perhaps also their wealth. Unfortunately, coins from the city depicts the two deities alone and not as a group, showing Asklepios enthroned and carrying a staff in his upraised left hand (fig.122). He wears an himation which covers his legs and left shoulder and he turns his head to his right. Imhoof Blumer regards the statue as a copy of the statue at Epidauros, but it is neither remarkable enough to show any distinct style of its own, nor is it close enough to the original statue by Thrasymedes to be viewed as a direct copy.⁷⁶ The Hygieia stands in much the same attitude as Damophon's statue of the goddess at Aegion, and her dress is also comparable. This figure is, in fact, almost identical to that of the Aegion statue, particularly the column with serpents in front of her. What is unusual about the two coins showing the deities is that they do not face each other, but both face towards their right. This may be due to the die cutter reversing one of the images, but may be evidence that the statues are not part of the group by Xenophilos and Stratos, but single cult statues. If, however, they do belong together, then the seated type for Asklepios was continually popular on the mainland of Greece and it is possible that the original model by Thrasymedes was used for inspiration, but not directly copied. Our knowledge of these two sculptors is not especially increased

⁷⁵ See Marcadé, 1957,I, 110.

⁷⁶ Imhoof-Blumer, 1887,90.

by the attribution of the Argos cult group depicted on the coins; their style cannot be determined from such slight evidence. Yet it is another case of known sculptors being contracted to carve cult images of the healing deities.

For the remainder of the second century B.C., there remains the interesting Asklepieion at Pheneos, where our only original Hellenistic cult image of Hygieia survives.

The Pheneos Group (catalogue number 13), figs. 40-43.

The complex of buildings comprising the sanctuary of Asklepios and Hygieia at Pheneos in northern Arkadia is one of the most unusual of Healing sanctuaries. It does not follow the general plan of a temple but incorporates four large rooms in the form of two small temples, the most important room being in the north and containing the large base for the cult images, measuring 4.81 x 2.95 x 1.00 metres, and thus large enough to support a group of figures of considerable size. The importance of this base is that it preserves the name of the sculptor who was employed to carve the cult images, namely Attalos the * Athenian, who is dated to the second century both stylistically and by the form of the letters on the inscription.⁷⁷ Otherwise his name is only known at Argos where a sculptor of the same name, though not necessarily the second century artist, carved a statue of Apollo for his sanctuary there.⁷⁸ Even more fortuitous is that fragments of the colossal cult images were recovered, including the massive head of Hygieia who was represented standing beside Asklepios on the base. Other fragments include the feet of both of the

⁷⁷ See Stewart, 1979, 163, in section headed Period IV.

⁷⁸ See section on Apollo.

figures. The sandalled feet of Asklepios are larger than those of the female figure and, like the feet of the acrolithic cult statue of Athena at Priene and the Lykosoura cult group, the modelling of the toes and leather straps of the sandals is extremely detailed and again demonstrates how parts of the body which were at eye level were given more attention than parts of the figure higher up. To try to date the feet stylistically would not be easy as no second-century statues have the exact same sandals.

The head of the goddess, however, is of a very unusual style and form. It is a visually impressive piece of sculpture with the facial features improving in appearance dramatically when seen from the intended, low viewpoint. Stylistic comparisons are hard to come by because the head is almost unique in its appearance, but Smith has likened the piece to the head of Dionysos from Aegira.⁷⁹ This comparison is adequate and the two sculptures are probably contemporary, yet the Hygieia is not as classicising as Stewart proposes.⁸⁰ It is legitimate to compare the sharply defined features of the two heads with the lips and nose being rigidly constructed out of sharp, hard contours. There is no distinction between skin, muscle and bone, but the flat, smooth planes of the flesh contrast harshly with the crumpled texture of the hair. They also have carefully delineated eyelids, and the Hygieia retains the almost alarmingly realistic eyes with their bronze eyelashes and staring pupils. The main difference is that the sculptor of the Aegira head was more competent in his treatment of the area around the eyes, and there is, at least, some attempt to distinguish between the soft areas of flesh around the eye sockets and the tenser skin over the cheeks. On Hygieia, the flesh is even harder in texture and the skull appears rounder and more

⁷⁹ Smith, 1991, 240.

⁸⁰ Stewart, 1979, 141, who claims that both Euboulides Athena and Attalos' Hygieia are strictly classicising and retrospective in style.

massive in structure, with the hairline being a continuous arch over the face as if a marble wig has been attached. The Dionysos still retains the dynamic modelling popular in the first half of the century, and is therefore probably slightly earlier in date than the Hygieia.

Despite this almost severe treatment of the head, a classicising label for the Hygieia seems unsatisfactory. She does not resemble early fifth century works in her appearance and is certainly not Phidian in form. She was frontal in posture and her expression is relentless, but no Classical original is quite so menacingly awe-inspiring in style. This is perhaps not what we would expect for the philanthropic goddess of health, perhaps more what we would expect for the goddesses Hera or Artemis. Any comparisons with the cult images of Hera from the Hellenistic period are rendered difficult by the lack of surviving examples, but the head by Attalos does bear a shallow resemblance to the Capitoline Hera in terms of the stern features and formally arranged hair, but the Hera is more Baroque in character whereas the Hygieia seems to follow a style of her own. Another parallel is to be found in a head of "Leto" from her sanctuary at Xanthos.⁸⁰ Here the modelling of the skin lacks tension and the hair is sketchy in its treatment, but the facial features have been modelled in a rather more sensitive manner than the Hygieia, particularly the mouth which is not as short and linear as that of the Pheneos head. One of the most effective stylistic comparisons is with the head of Kore on the so-called Lakrateides relief from Eleusis, usually dated to the start of the first century B.C.⁸¹ In both examples the face has a massive structure with a large and broad nose. The hairline forms a harsh triangle and the hair waves in a crinkly manner from a central point. The expression of the

⁸⁰ See earlier section on Hera.

⁸¹ See Horn, 1938, plate 19, 2, for a detailed photograph of the head.

Kore is austere and the carving is hard and linear in style. Attalos' head probably dates to the second half of the second century but the Eleusis relief shows how sculptors continued creating works in a dry and mechanical, though not necessarily dull, manner. The carving of the Hygieia by Attalos is equally dry and clear cut, which is an effective way of producing such colossal statuary, because each feature would be clearly distinct and the whole appearance is monumental and simple, unlike some of the more elaborate and flamboyant sculptures from the earlier part of the second century B.C. The effect is not unpleasant, but it is striking in its simplicity. Whether the sculptors who worked in this style made a conscious effort to reject the extremities of the Baroque style is unclear. Attalos probably also excelled in the acrolithic technique which began to re-gain popularity around the middle of the second century B.C. The Athena from Priene and Dionysos at Aegira were both acrolithic and colossal in scale. At Pheneos, fragments of ivory, iron nails and traces of carbonized wood were recovered around the base of the statues which lends favour to them being acrolithic. The Asklepios may have been naked to the waist, the torso either made of marble or perhaps ivory, then draped in wooden or ivory garments; Hygieia may have just been made of marble and wood. If this was the case, then the two statues would have been constructed out of different materials, rather like some of Damophon's earlier cult groups. Yet we must await further publication of the Asklepieion at Pheneos, to fully understand the techniques used by Attalos to produce the cult group. At any rate the Pheneos group, even though it was not as expensive an offering as the Athena from Priene, must have been a drain on the town's resources. Presumably the cults of the healing deities there brought sufficient patients to pay for the

grand embellishment of the shrine. Unfortunately we know very little about the sanctuary other than its unusual form.

The group was probably made in the third quarter of the second century B.C., but the exact form of the two statues is difficult to restore due to the missing figure of Asklepios and the lack of Hygieia's body. That the Asklepios was larger in size than his daughter is evident from the discrepancy in dimensions of the two pairs of feet; he may have been seated to alleviate this difference in scale. In the small complex of interconnecting rooms of the Asklepieion the cult group would have been overwhelming, much like the Lykosoura group. The base dominated practically the whole portion of the cella and the colossal image of Hygieia would have reached over three metres in height. When the two figures were complete with ivory decoration, inlaid eyes and colour, the whole group would have been spectacularly awe inspiring.

Given the amount of surviving sculptures representing Asklepios, the interesting fragment of Hygieia from Pheneos and the numismatic and literary evidence, it has been possible to assess the iconography of the two healing deities in detail. What is evident is that, because Asklepios was a relative newcomer to the Olympian pantheon, sculptors only had a few prototypes to work from. This does not necessarily mean that they adhered to the stylistic characteristics of only a few renowned Classical originals during the Hellenistic period, but it is certain that the types used for the cult images in new temples follow similar models. The standing Asklepios was perhaps more common in the third and early second century with the seated type becoming more common in the second century, but

there is not enough evidence to prove that all of the latter cult statues were copies of the Asklepios at Epidauros, or the former re-workings of Alkamenes' Athenian statue.

One of the most popular of the all the Olympian deities during the Hellenistic period was Dionysos, yet there are surprisingly few preserved cult images. This is even more perplexing when one considers the prominent position of Dionysos in the minor arts. A possible reason for this scarcity of surviving cult statues may have been that many of them were manufactured out of precious or perishable materials. Furthermore, acrolithic cult images were popular during the Hellenistic period, but the nature of their construction makes it less likely that they would have survived. A few great temples were dedicated to Dionysos in this period, particularly in the revived cities of western Asia Minor, but little is known about the appearance of their cult images. Iconographical surveys of Dionysos in the plastic arts are numerous with the most comprehensive surveys being those of Pochmarski. The first of these analysed the Archaic and Classical representations of the god and the second dealt with groups showing Dionysos with members of his entourage.¹ Other scholars have worked upon individual sculptures portraying the god and their work is useful in attempting to determine the changes in the iconography of Dionysos. Coins can be also be useful, but the literary records tell us nothing about his temple statues. Only two fragments remain of cult statues, one from Athens which may be an early Hellenistic fragment and another from Aegira, traditionally identified as the Zeus by Eukleides, but interesting here because of the possibility that it may in fact be the remains of a cult image of Dionysos instead. We are fortunate, however, in possessing many Roman copies of statues of the god, some of which possibly derive from Hellenistic originals. Roman copyists were, however, usually commissioned to produce rather languid

¹ Pochmarski, 1974 and 1990.

and effeminate statues of the god, which may or may not exactly reproduce Hellenistic prototypes. An important element in this chapter is that the iconography of Dionysos and Apollo become fused together and this feature will be a fundamental issue throughout the analysis. The union of Dionysos with Apollo and also with Zeus, and surprisingly even with Aphrodite, will become clear throughout this section, but how far this was an element of the cult statues of Dionysos will be difficult to ascertain because of the lack of original cult images. It may have been possible that in religious statuary Dionysos was portrayed in a more dignified manner and retained his classically formed identity.

Fortunately several superb originals survive from Hellenistic monuments, but because many of these were erected in choregic monuments, which were elaborate votive offerings to the god, they cannot be classified as cult images. Impressive Hellenistic originals from Thasos, Delphi and Athens remain and are of great help in defining the changes in iconography from the Classical to the Hellenistic period, but in a study of cult images they can only be utilised as comparisons with statues erected in temples. It will also be interesting to briefly survey Classical models and to see whether the few celebrated statues of the god, such as Alkamenes' cult image in Athens, influenced later cult statues. If there was such a change in the iconography of Dionysos during the late Classical and early Hellenistic period, then we might expect the later statues to have little in common with Classical masterpieces.²

² The gold and ivory cult image of Dionysos by Alkamenes was set up in his temple by the theatre in Athens. Pausanias recorded this image, 1,20,3.

The Late Classical Forerunners

Dionysos was a popular subject during the late Classical period and was the subject of many famous sculptors' works. These craftsmen may have been involved in the transition of the iconography of Dionysos from the athletic Classical type to the more effeminate, languid Hellenistic types copied during the Roman period. Unfortunately, even though we possess valuable information concerning the whereabouts of these late Classical cult statues, no fragments survive and it is difficult to associate later copies with these images. Praxiteles produced three famous statues of the god, two of which were later to be found in Rome.³ One of the sculptor's most celebrated statues of the god was at Elis but again little is known about the statue.⁴ The only statue, which is preserved in numerous copies, that has been tentatively associated with Praxiteles is the Dionysos Sardanapalos. This statue has archaizing traits which has led some scholars to believe that the statue was made in the late Hellenistic period, but Ridgway sees the drapery formation as late Classical in design.⁵ In fact the tightly bound himation with the sweep of folds over his left shoulder is reminiscent of the Demeter from Knidos, so perhaps a date around 330 B.C. is appropriate.⁶ The overall appearance and style of the piece does not, however, have much in common with other copies of Praxiteles' works, and so the statue's original context and master must remain a mystery. The significance of this piece is that it

³ Pliny informs us that a group of Dionysos a satyr and Methe was made by the master sculptor. Pliny, NH 34.69-70. Another group in bronze was also later in Rome. Dionysos was also shown as a child carried by Hermes in the famous and controversial group at Olympia which is perhaps the work of the fourth century sculptor.

⁴ Pausanias, 6,26,1.

⁵ For a fuller argument see Ridgway, 1990,91 and Robertson who attributes the type to the time and perhaps even the hand of Praxiteles, Robertson, 1975,396. Stewart, 1990,198-199 also views the original as late fourth century.

⁶ See Pochmarski, 1972-3, 41-67 for a list of replicas.

represents a bearded Dionysos and demonstrates how sculptors still occasionally portrayed the god as he had been in the Archaic and early Classical periods. This should not be viewed as a deliberate archaizing trend, but rather as a type selected for a particular cult title of the god. This type of bearded and aged Dionysos is, in all probability, the result of a syncretism of the cult of Dionysos and Sabazios, a god who was also associated with Zeus.⁷ It may have functioned as a temple image, with the frontality of its pose, its sombre and clothed appearance and the rather cursory treatment of the rear part of the statue, suggesting that it stood on a pedestal by a wall.

The sculptors Skopas and Bryaxis also created statues of Dionysos which both stood at Knidos in western Asia Minor, but we know nothing more of these statues other than Pliny's brief comments.⁸ There have been no successful attempts to attribute surviving copies with these statues but for a statue of Dionysos by Lysippos which stood in his sanctuary on Mount Helikon we may possess a copy.⁹ Dörig proposed that a head of the god in Venice, that is attached to a body which does not belong, is convincingly similar enough to the head of the Apoxyomenos in the Vatican to be a copy of the statue by Lysippos.¹⁰ The Venice head is not of fine quality, but there are convincing parallels. Both have broad cheeks and a rounded skull and the foreheads are curved. The cheeks have a certain fleshiness about them, as do the lips of the short, curving mouths. The eyes are quite dissimilar, but this is due to the Dionysos having widely opened eyes which roll upwards rather than looking straight forward like the Apoxyomenos. One distinct

⁷ The god Sabazios possibly originated in either Thrace or Phrygia.

⁸ Pliny NH, 36,20-21.

⁹ Pausanias, 9,30,1.

¹⁰ Dörig, 1973,131, figs.1-20, plates 42-44.

similarity, however, is the modelling of the long and thick strands of hair on both heads. Given the limitations generated by comparing two such copies, however, it is difficult to assess the impact of the cult image by Lysippos or its influence on later statues of the god.

Surviving statues of Dionysos from the late Classical period in original form are rare. Only the head and torso from the pediment of the fourth century temple of Apollo at Delphi can safely be assigned to the late Classical period but this, of course, was not a cult image, although it deserves mention here as a fine example of the merging of Dionysos with Apollo. Two possible fragments remain of the central figure of the god consisting of a high belted torso of the Kitharoidos type and a large head which probably belongs.¹¹ The style of the head certainly appears late Classical in date and shows the god in the early stages of transformation into a more feminine form. The most interesting feature of this statue of the god is its Apolline appearance. The two gods have been brought together at Delphi, showing two extremes that are mutually dependant upon each other. In the east pediment Apollo stood with his Muses as symbols of wisdom, the arts, theatre and music. In the west pediment the destructive and ecstatic forces of Dionysian ritual, the Thyaiids, were shown around a central figure of the god. Yet for such a scene the statue of Dionysos is unusual in that he is represented with long robes as a Kitharoidos type, in other words he is Dionysos merged with Apollo. As Smith points out their common interests lay in the theatre and, in the early Hellenistic period, for their roles as both protectors and ancestors of the new Hellenistic monarchies.¹² There is also a link

¹¹ Smith, pers.corr. is uncertain whether the head and body belong and dates the head, stylistically to the third not fourth century, comparing it to the Thasian head, see Smith, 1991,65.

¹² Smith, 1991,65.

between the two gods through the Muses. In the Classical period it was usually Apollo who was depicted with the Muses, but because of their relationship with theatrical events and drama, a connection with Dionysos should not be regarded as surprising.¹³ The iconography and attributes of the two gods has begun to merge and later we will find that it was Apollo who appeared to transform into Dionysos rather than the reverse. For his cult images Dionysos may have retained his distinct characteristics and appeared more immediately recognisable as the god, but lack of material remains renders such a conjecture impossible to demonstrate.

The Early Hellenistic Period

As the Hellenistic period progresses, decorative and votive statues show Dionysos in a more intoxicated manner, often with the presence of satyrs or other members of his entourage, but these may not reproduce his cult images.¹⁴ In the early Hellenistic period, however, there are several fine originals which will be outlined, but remains of his cult images are rare.

The Athens Dionysos (catalogue number 28), figs. 87-88.

The only possible fragment of an early Hellenistic cult image of the god is a battered head, found in the region of Makryiannis south of the Acropolis. The head has only been published by Bruskari, who proposes that the figure must be from a cult image due to its

¹³ On the statue base from Mantinea, reputedly the work of Praxiteles, Apollo was depicted with the nine Muses. See Stewart, 1990, figs.492-4.

¹⁴ Pochmarski, 1990, illustrates several examples of these statues.

colossal dimensions, its frontal position and the summary working of the sides and back of the head, which suggests that it was originally positioned against a wall. The reconstructed height of the figure would be approximately 4.00 metres but it is not clear whether the statue was seated or standing but the sharp incline of the face suggests a seated figure. The author mentions that the only temple in that region of Athens where the cult image could have been placed is the temple of Dionysos in the marshes which, Thucydides informs us, was south of the Acropolis. This temple is dated earlier than the Hellenistic period, and if the fragment actually belonged to the temple, then it must have either been a later replacement or have stood beside more ancient image. All this is speculative, however, as the temple has not been reliably identified.

Stylistically the head appears early Hellenistic in form, and Bruskari describes it as a post-Praxitelean work, perhaps by one of his sons who flourished, according to Pliny, in the 121st Olympiad (296-293). Comparable works of sculpture are rare, but the head appears to resemble the head of a statuette from Priene and a head of the god from Sparta.¹⁵ The Priene example has a comparable hairstyle, but the rather small scale of the figure renders reliable stylistic parallels difficult. The hair, on both, is pulled back from a central parting into coils of intricately woven strands which, on the Priene example, are fastened in a knot at the back of the head. The Athenian head lacks its rear section, but it is possible that the arrangement here was similar. On the Athens head the hair is even more intricately arranged with an upper layer of braids on the crown which form small, lozenge shaped locks and the whole appears like a rather tight fitting skull cap. Bruskari quotes the so-

¹⁵ For the Priene statuette see Wiegand and Schrader, 1904,369, fig.643 and for the Sparta head see Todd and Wace, 1906,143, no.59.

called Smaller Herculaneum woman as having a similar hairstyle.¹⁶ The two heads do indeed correspond in certain details and both seem to post-date, and to have been influenced by Praxiteles, but the arrangement of the hair only really compares in terms of its intricate arrangement. The actual design is different with the Herculaneum type possessing the so-called *melon coiffure* which is drawn back in segments over the crown rather than being braided around the skull, as on the Dionysos.

The Priene statuette is perhaps the closest parallel and follows the Lysippean canon of proportions. The torso and legs are long and the head is small in proportion to the height of the figure, but there is also a certain weakness of the nude form which suggests the influence of Praxiteles. The flesh of the arms, chest and legs have a loose structure and the hips and thighs are rather feminine in form. We can perhaps restore the Athens head to a similar body, but a naked figure of such colossal dimensions would have been unstable and the use of props and supports would be necessary, particularly if the figure was standing.

Bruskari suggests that the figure from which the Athens head came was standing. It may then have been draped rather in the manner of the Dionysos from Choregic monument B on Thasos, which probably dates to the early part of the third century. This heavily draped, yet provocatively poised figure, has a well developed *contrapposto* and appears rather like the Muse Melpomene, who was often depicted with her foot raised.¹⁷ It has been suggested that the statue was originally completed with a kithara, and that this would

¹⁶ Bruskari, 1988,57.

¹⁷ See Ridgway, 1990, chapter 7.

explain the voluminous robes worn in the manner of Apollo.¹⁸ If this is the case, the statue again shows the merging of the two divinities into one, because of their interchangeable functions. The pardalis, slung over his shoulder, also alludes to the Maenads and subsequently to the more savage and frenzied aspects of his cult and rituals. Another noticeable feature of this figure is that as Dionysos becomes more provocative in appearance he becomes slightly less muscular in form. This suggests that the Hellenistic view of the erotic male figure was one of insinuated femininity and perhaps also one of adolescence. This can be found in statues of Dionysos, Apollo and Eros who all seem to become more youthful over the period. The clinging material of the chiton reveals a flabbier physique, with a swollen abdomen, perhaps a symbol of sexuality and eroticism, this being one of the statue's most conspicuous features. The head from Athens is of a rather feminine type which would suit such a draped figure as the Thasos statue, and the voluminous himation around the feet would support the colossal figure. It would be all the more interesting if fragments of the body of the Dionysos from Athens had been recovered, mainly to determine if it was usual for the cult images of the god to be draped. Original statues of the god from the early Hellenistic period are invariably draped and thus were still quite conservative renditions of Dionysos. This is perhaps even more fascinating because we might have expected to find that the sculptor Praxiteles, with his rather sensual and feminine portrayals of the younger male deities, had subsequently influenced early Hellenistic sculptors more noticeably.

But one question that requires discussion is technique of the statue from which the head alone survives. The head is damaged and it is not possible to ascertain whether the figure

¹⁸ See Gasparri, 1986, 437, number 129 for this recommendation.

was carved from several pieces of marble or whether it was acrolithic. The former proposal is perhaps impractical, but not impossible, as the large standing figures from Klaros reveal, as such a colossal figure made entirely out of marble would have required a great many struts and supports. If we are to consider the acrolithic technique, one can hardly envisage a nude figure as the joins would be visible. The answer may be that the statue was draped rather in the manner of the Thasian statue with both chiton, himation and perhaps an additional panther skin. All this is speculative, but the statue's importance rests on its qualification as a possible major Athenian cult figure from the early Hellenistic period, using the acrolithic mode of construction. Furthermore, the fact that nothing else of the body survives, increases the likelihood of the remainder of the figure being made out of perishable material such as wood.

Because of this lack of the body of the statue any stylistic analysis must be based solely on the head. The expression is dreamy and related to those heads assigned to the pupils of Praxiteles, examples being the two heads of Aphrodite in Boston and the Aberdeen Herakles, but given the poor state of preservation of the Athens Dionysos and its lack of original context, the head tells us very little.¹⁹ Stylistically it dates from the late fourth to early third century and was carved by a sculptor who was under the influence of Praxiteles and his pupils. As for its function as a cult image, all that can be said is that in its original form and within a possible temple setting the statue would have been imposing, not only for its colossal size, but its great presence would have been supplemented by its excellent quality. The details of the hair and the facial features are

¹⁹ For the two heads of Aphrodite in Boston see Lawrence, 1927, plates 6 and 77, and for the Aberdeen Herakles, British Museum sculpture 1600, see Stewart, 1990, fig.496.

superbly modelled and the skin and flesh tones betray a great master at work and one whose name may have been recorded. As already mentioned, Bruskari suggests one of the sons of Praxiteles, which is a viable proposition, but one which we cannot verify either in the literary record, as no statues of the god are recorded for these two sculptors. The Athens Dionysos continued the general, but slow, process of creating a more feminine and languid god, a characteristic hinted at in the earlier statue from Delphi. The sculptures found at Thasos continue, albeit slowly, this transformation.

During the third century several temples were constructed to Dionysos, for example at Miletos and possibly at Thasos, perhaps close to the choregic monuments in the sanctuary. Few traces survive of the Miletos temple and at Thasos no temple has been found, but further excavations may reveal the temple and possibly remnants of the cult image. For the rest of the third century there is evidence for two cult images of the god. One is a figure of Dionysos from a choregic monument from Athens, probably to be dated to the first quarter of the third century and thus contemporary with the sculptural remains from Thasos. The other is from the largest known Hellenistic temple of the god, at Teos, where coins may show the cult image.

The "Thrasylllos" Dionysos (catalogue number 29), figs. 89-91.

The colossal and headless statue of Dionysos from the monument of Thrasylllos in Athens, now in the British Museum, poses several problems in terms of its original context and its date. The seated figure, almost two metres in height, shows a restraint in modelling and frontal pose that would make it a fine candidate for one of the god's cult images. The

statue is one of the most sedate and conservative renditions of Dionysos and is generally viewed as a product of the traditional Athenian schools of the early third century. The Dionysos has almost universally been considered an early example of a classicising work which was directly inspired by the Parthenon pediments. Scholars who accept its third century date and describe it as conservative in style include Becatti who claimed that it was inspired by the Parthenon pediments, and Carpenter who labelled it a severely quiet and impressive work. Robertson called it classicising in style and Ridgway described it as massive and classicising. Smith has recently dismissed the Dionysos as dull and conservative.²⁰ Other scholars have correctly viewed the Dionysos with a little more attention to the carving of the drapery with its deeply chiselled folds in the lap which produces even more shadow than later sculptures such as the drapery on the Zeus Sosipolis from Magnesia. Havelock, regarded the piece as classicising, but emphasized the Baroque influence in its colossal form and the dramatic effect of light and shade throughout the drapery.²¹

Given the lack of original third century sculptures in general, locating similarly modelled pieces is difficult. The Themis from Rhamnous is usually classified with the Dionysos because of the statue's quiet and retrospective style, but the two statues are extremely different. The sculptor of the Themis was a less competent sculptor who was unaware of the modern and vibrant modelling style that was developing in the eastern Aegean. The sculptor of the Dionysos is quite traditional in his choice of posture, but he carved the drapery with a vigorous use of the chisel which reveals his more modern approach. The

²⁰ Becatti, 1940,24-25; Carpenter, 1960, 186; Robertson, 1975,481; Ridgway, 1990, 212, Smith, 1991, 239.

²¹ Havelock, 1981,138.

deep, sweeping folds across the lap of the seated figure compares with later renditions of male and female deities, such as the Magnesia Zeus, the Lykosoura cult statues and the Getty Zeus. Given these parallels, it is difficult to locate a close dating for the figure. A dating mechanism for the statue can perhaps be located in the footwear. The Dionysos wears high soled sandals with a broad and shallow indentation which is suggestive of the early Hellenistic period.²² This type of footwear was normally, but not exclusively, associated with female figures, particularly the Muses which is further evidence for the statue depicting Dionysos in his role as Musagetes.

One interesting point is the type of image used for the Dionysos, which like the Delphi and Thasos figures, is heavily draped, wearing a voluminous himation over a chiton, and the Thasian and Athens figures have the additional *pardalis* or panther skin. The Athens figure is portrayed almost like Melpomene and Dionysos has also been fused with Apollo Musagetes, so that it appears as a more sober embodiment of Dionysos. It is interesting that Stuart and Revett restored a female head to the statue when they drew the figure as it was originally positioned on the monument, but the forms of the body are certainly masculine and thus the identification as a Muse was mistaken.²³

Ridgway noted that the statue was perhaps not added to the monument of Thrasyillos until 271-270 B.C. when Thrasykles dedicated an inscription and possibly the statue.²⁴ This * date is appropriate for the style of the figure, but it has recently been suggested that its position was originally intended for, and may well have supported, a tripod. If this was

²² See Morrow, 1985, for further analysis of Greek footwear and dating of sculpture.

²³ For this drawing see Travlos, 1971, fig.708.

²⁴ Ridgway, 1990,212.

the case, then the statue may have been brought in from elsewhere at a later date.²⁵ Given the rather formal and static posture of the Dionysos, it is possible that it was originally dedicated as a cult image within a temple setting. The frontal and seated attitude of the figure is appropriate for such a function, although, of course, this is pure speculation. If, however, the statue was not placed on the monument during the restoration by Thrasykles, but was added at a later date instead, there is potential for re-dating the Dionysos to the later third century or perhaps even, as Havelock proposes, to the early second century B.C.²⁶

Further evidence for the statue having been placed against a wall, is the deep, vertical cutting at the back of the figure, which was probably carved to relieve the weight of the marble. It is also interesting to examine the visual impact of the figure, particularly when it is viewed from a great distance below, as it was when it was placed on the Thrasyllon monument. Stuart and Revett could only observe and sketch the Dionysos from the southern slope of the Acropolis and from this angle the figure appears squat and heavy with the upper body fore-shortened to a point where the figure is cumbersome and its proportions clumsy. It does not fit in well with the location or architectural setting of the building, and was probably, therefore, not part of the general scheme. From a low angle, however, the figure spreads horizontally and its vertical axis is shortened. On a low base, perhaps inside a temple, the figure takes on more natural proportions as the upper torso appears slimmer and more elegant. If the figure was indeed a cult figure, before it was removed and placed on the Thrasyllon monument, we can only guess at its original

²⁵ Both Havelock, 1981,138 and Ridgway, 1990,212 remark upon this, but neither believe that the statue was created in late antiquity.

²⁶ See Havelock, 1981,138.

location. The colossal size and weight of the figure may suggest that it was not transported a long distance, but during the Roman period it was common practice for whole temples to be transferred from remote parts of Attika to central Athens, so why not whole cult images.²⁷ Much of this relocation of monuments seems to have occurred during the first century B.C. and it is possible that the Dionysos was an element of such a relocation policy by the Romans.

On the whole, the statue has a monumental appearance which would not preclude it from having originally been carved as a cult image. Its date is difficult to secure and there are third and second century elements in the rendering of the drapery, footwear and in terms of stylistic comparisons.

The Second Century B.C.

There is a distinct lack of statues representing Dionysos that can be dated to this period. Only the head from Aegira, which is not generally accepted as portraying the god, can be dated to the second century B.C., and as already mentioned, from the two most important temples of Dionysos at Teos and Pergamon there is only slight evidence for the cult images.

²⁷ The temple of Ares in the Athenian Agora is thought to have been brought from elsewhere in Attika and also parts of the temple of Athena at Sounion and Demeter from Thorikos were transported to Athens.

The Dionysos Setaireios at Teos

The temple at Teos was dedicated to Dionysos, the patron deity of the district of Teos, under the unusual epithet "Setaireios", probably to be translated as meaning 'of the present year'. The date of the temple to Dionysos is the subject of some controversy and the arguments revolve around the dating of the architect, known as Hermogenes. Scholarly opinion varies and dates for the architect's career range from the later third to the mid second century B.C.²⁸ Recently, however, attempts have been made to update the career of Hermogenes into the later third or early second centuries. One of the strongest arguments for this re-dating is supported historically. It is reasonable to suggest that the temple would have been a more viable project when the city was at its political and economic peak. A possible time would be at the end of the third century when Teos was selected as the residence of the Ionian branch of the Guild of Artists of Dionysos and the sanctuary was granted holy status and considered hallowed ground. Like the earlier sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphitrite on Tenos, such sacred land would attract prominence and, as a consequence of this, financial patronage. This sanctity was only weakened in the mid second century when the Guild were forced to move their headquarters to Ephesos because of a series of disputes with the local people.²⁹ Thus we might reasonably suspect that any ambitious building programmes would have been undertaken before this date. Therefore the usual date for Hermogenes' activity at Teos, around 130 B.C., seems far too late. Further evidence for an earlier construction date for

²⁸ See Ridgway, 1990,200, note 6, for most comprehensive bibliography. Özgan, 1982,196-209, prefers a date in the last quarter of the third century B.C. based on the style of the sculptures from the Temple at Magnesia, see Linfert, 1976,164-177 for this high dating. Akurgal, 1987,87, adheres to the later dating, in the second half of the second century B.C. For the most recent and detailed analysis of the architectural history of the temple at Teos see Uz, 1990,51-61.

²⁹ See Pickard-Cambridge, 1988 (revised),294.

the temple is bolstered by epigraphic evidence. An inscription concerning the privileges presented to the Seleucid monarchs Antiochos III and his queen Stratonike describes how marble images of the semi-divine pair were erected in the cella of the temple next to the cult statue of Dionysos.³⁰ Antiochos' presence at Teos is probably to be dated to 204 B.C. after his return from the campaigns in the eastern limits of his kingdom and such a date would not be at odds with the up-dating of Hermogenes.³¹

To place the statue in its narrower setting, excavations have revealed the plan of the temple which was peripteral with 6 by 11 Ionic columns resting on a stylobate measuring 18.5 x 35.0 metres. Much of the temple was restored and the building embellished during the reign of Hadrian. In terms of scale, it is the largest Hellenistic temple dedicated to the god and therefore the cult image could well have been of colossal proportions.

Further evidence can be found through the study of coins issued by the city. Davesne analysed the possible representations of the cult statue on both Hellenistic and Roman coins and proposed that the main cult image of the god survived intact until an earthquake devastated the temple in 46-47 A.D. The cult image was modified and appears slightly different on coins issued during the reigns of Agrippina, Nero and Octavia.³² Three coins showing Alexander types on the front have an enthroned figure of Zeus on the reverse, but what is interesting is that in each example, beneath the outstretched right arm of the god, are obvious Dionysian symbols.³³ One shows a seated kithara player, another

³⁰ For this inscription see Austin, 1981,(reprint 1989,254), no.151. *

³¹ The city of Teos was also under the considerable influence of the Pergamene kings who were not averse to fostering cults of Dionysos, the patron deity of their dynasty.

³² Davesne, 1987,15-20, plate II.

³³ The coins in question, illustrated by Davesne, are tetradrachmae showing an Alexander type portrait on one side, though probably not depicting Alexander himself, wearing a lion cap.

a kantharos and the third a diminutive standing statue of Dionysos. Significantly the god is shown bearded and holding a kantharos, but this Archaic type of image is usually fully draped, whereas on the coin, he is shown with an himation draped around his lower body and over his right shoulder; in other words he is wearing his standard Hellenistic attire. It is unclear from the coins whether a chiton covers his torso in the manner of the statue from choregic monument B from Thasos, but if it was present, it may indicate a third century date. An illuminating feature is the god's close relationship with Zeus on these coins, a detail which will become more clear when the cult image from Aegira is discussed later. The only problem with the coins circulated by the Teotes is that some bear a head of the youthful Dionysos, and an example dating from the reign of Gallienus has a full length, semi-draped figure of the god, accompanied by a satyr, and Dionysos wears an himation which has slipped down over his abdomen.³⁴ This latter image, however, may not reproduce a cult image at all, but rather a decorative or votive group. Arguably the most constructive evidence should come from those coins showing the statue in its temple, but unfortunately these are often too illegible to be of much assistance. What is clear, however, is that the temple statue is draped, at least over the lower body, and that the right arm was raised and held a thyrsos. The earliest of these coins are the Alexander tetradrachmae and date to the later third century, probably to the period of Antiochos III's influence in the city. Thus again the year 204 B.C. springs to mind and it is possible that both temple and cult image were dedicated shortly after this date.

A further problem, however, is that the cult image shown on coins could have stood in an earlier temple, but no trace of a pre-Hellenistic structure survives beneath the foundations

³⁴ For an illustration see Pochmarski, 1990, plate 82,2.

of the temple by Hermogenes. It is possible that an earlier shrine was built elsewhere and has not been located or that no trace of it survives. The answer may be that an earlier sanctuary may have been destroyed in the catastrophic earthquake which shook Ionia in 204 B.C., and, if this was the case, then the temple site would have lain in ruins briefly until a time when the population could afford to reconstruct a new shrine for the god, that time being late in the third or early in the second century B.C. Then an earlier cult image may have been re-used, much in the same way that it was re-housed in the Roman reconstruction of the temple. Leaving speculation aside, however, the evidence seems to point to there being a temple dedicated to the god in the mid Hellenistic period and this, if we are to believe the recent conclusions, would have been the temple by Hermogenes. What is interesting is that an older, bearded type of Dionysos was venerated within the sanctuary, but not in an archaistic, draped manner like the Aegira statue or the Sardanopolos type, but rather of the semi-draped variety which is so typical of early and mid Hellenistic statues of the god. Since no fragment of the cult image survives it may have seemed unnecessary to dwell upon the subject in so much detail, but for his most highly revered and celebrated of Hellenistic sanctuaries, such a lengthy discussion seems warranted.

Dionysos at Pergamon

The importance of Dionysos at Pergamon was as his role as protector of the Attalid dynasty. He was a patron of their rule and power, as Athena was patron of the city itself. An Ionic temple was built for the god near the theatre, with an imposing flight of steps. It was originally built in the second century, but reconstructed after a fire in the Roman

period and re-dedicated to Caracella. Unfortunately no trace of the Hellenistic cult statue survives, nor do coins from the city seem to show statues of Dionysos. His association with the theatre in the city is obvious by the location of his temple and he may have been portrayed in his Musagetes guise, but we can only speculate as to the original appearance of the cult image.

Another temple of the god located close to a theatre is at Aegira in Achaia from which fragments of a colossal cult image were recovered. Its identification as a Dionysos is by no means clear and thus it merits detailed examination.

The Dionysos at Aegira (catalogue number 14), figs. 44-47.

The colossal head and arm found earlier in the century at Aegira in Achaia have been almost unanimously identified as fragments of the cult statue of Zeus seen by Pausanias who tells us that it was the work of Eukleides. Not until recently has the identification as Zeus been challenged and the statue re-identified as a Dionysos instead, but this new theory has not met with much enthusiasm.³⁵ Madigan's theories are, however, interesting as they throw new light upon an important cult image that was previously neglected and only cited either as the work of Eukleides, and our only indication of the style of that sculptor, or as an example of the so-called classicising tendencies prevalent in the later second century B.C. Since Madigan's welcome, yet controversial, article, the head can be reconsidered and analysed and the arguments in terms of style and iconography, which were, incidentally, the least effective elements of Madigan's assessment, will hopefully

³⁵ Madigan, 1991.

demonstrate that the god may be Dionysos, or at least a merging of the characteristics of the two gods into one image to represent and serve a particular cult.

Various discussions on the style of the Aegira head point to the academic classicism of the piece, and the head is usually categorised with works such as those by Damophon and Euboulides whose possible head of Athena is touched upon in the relevant chapter. The comparisons made are usually rather nebulous and ill defined and even recent scholars have failed to justify their inclusion of the head amongst so-called neo-Classical pieces of the mid to later second century B.C. The fundamental flaw in Stewart's interpretation of the style of Eukleides is that the author fails to consider the dynamic or Baroque qualities in the carving of the hair or modelling of the skin tones.³⁶ Admittedly the style of the head is less flagrantly dynamic than the head of Zeus from Troy, or even the slightly milder, but still powerfully modelled Asklepios from Mounychia. The facial features of the Aegira head are indeed more bluntly chiselled and massively formed than either of the other examples. The reason for this, however, may not have anything to do with a possible later date, or deliberate attempt by the sculptor to re-create the austere cult images of the high Classical period, but simply because of the colossal scale and location of the head. The style suited the gloomy conditions within the cella.

The same applies to the rendering of the hair and beard where the sculptor used the drill extensively to isolate the curls and separate the locks with deeply wrought channels. On both the Asklepios of Mounychia and the Trojan Zeus the locks of hair appear more fluid and blend in at the cheeks, rather than forming an abrupt transition which is obvious on

³⁶ Stewart, 1979,51.

the Aegira head. Yet the strands of hair still retain a life of their own; they have not been carved in a rigid, symmetrical or mechanical way. On the right side of the head, where the original surface is better preserved, the beard has the effect of swelling out and pushing downwards with the lower locks not appearing to connect with the chin. The peculiar length of the beard and its rather pointed profile, which is unlike all Hellenistic heads of Zeus, does indeed have much more in common with Hellenistic images of Dionysos, for example the god on the so-called Ikarios reliefs.³⁷

Madigan's re-identification of the head as a Dionysos is based upon archaeological and iconographical factors. On the former consideration, his arguments are effective but on the latter he is not as successful. In his account of the modelling of the flesh tones and the facial features, he correctly observes the rather inflated stretches of skin and flesh over the cheek bones and around the outer corners of the eye sockets. This is certainly different to the opinion of most scholars who would see the handling of the skin surfaces as harsh, sharp and clear cut, and in this remark Madigan must be commended. Where his arguments fail, however, are his rather generalised thoughts on the iconography of Zeus, who he proposes retained a harsh and bony exterior conveying the impression of "sagacity born of age and experience". On the contrary he views the Aegira head as a Dionysos due to the turgid flesh tones which to Madigan, "suggests a history of soft living and indulgence".³⁸ This is a classic instance of reading too much into the simple facial features and general physiognomy. The Aegira head does indeed have more in common with other representations of Dionysos than it does with those of Zeus, typified by the

³⁷ Illustrated in Pochmarski, 1990, plates 30-33.

³⁸ Madigan, 1991, 507.

contemporary Trojan head and Malibu statue, but this new identification requires further justification.

Such parallels are important in determining the identity of the personality portrayed at Aegira. The most obvious comparison is with the so-called Dionysos Sardanopolos type. In this statue there was certainly the sculptor's intention to merge the iconographical traits of both Zeus and Dionysos, even though we must remember that the two gods could be confused and that the famous statue of Dionysos by Alkamenes in his Athenian shrine may well have been modelled on the statue of Zeus by Phidias at Olympia. Pausanias also adds to the argument here, for he mentions a statue of Zeus at Megalopolis who appears like Dionysos, a work of Polykleitos the younger.³⁹ This blending of iconographical features which are compatible with several deities has already been demonstrated in the case of Apollo and Dionysos, where the two gods become interchangeable and difficult to distinguish. Obviously the patron of the cult statue of Dionysos at Aegira specified that the image be more austere and orthodox in appearance than the typically Hellenistic semi-draped, Apolline statues of the god. By merging the rather frivolous character of Dionysos with the solemn king of the Olympians, the cult was probably more acceptable as an important feature of the religious life of one of the cities of the Achaean League.

Further evidence for its identification as Dionysos, apart from the peculiar length and shape of the beard, is the evidence for a wreath which Madigan points out. The small holes which are visible, particularly on the right side of the head, were probably both for

³⁹ Pausanias, 8,31.4. Polykleitos the younger's career lay in the later fifth century to the early fourth B.C.

the attachment of additional locks, a feature noted in the construction of the hair on the Poseidon of Melos, and also for a wreath which rested on the swept back hair. Even more convincing is the evidence remaining for the length of the hair. If this were a Hellenistic portrayal of Zeus, we might expect the sculptor to have followed the established pattern and rendered the hair thick and voluminous and hanging over the ears and blending in with the beard. This hairstyle is apparent on the Otricoli Zeus, the Trojan head and the Zeus Sosipolis from Magnesia on the Maeander which in other respects is the Aegira head's closest companion. Madigan, however, restores short, isolated locks hanging just in front of the ears, hopefully in a position where it would conceal the careless rendering of the right ear in particular. The only figure which comes anywhere near this proposed hairstyle is the Sardanopolos type, where the locks are swept back over the forehead and then run in horizontal bands over the ears. The execution of the hair is far more rigid in this type but this is probably due to the copyist and may also, in part, reflect the archaistic mannerisms of the figure. On the Aegira head the hair is so fragmentary that it is difficult to restore the original arrangement, but the strands are swept horizontally from the temples and do not hang in vertical, curly locks as on many other representations of bearded father deities. The main difference between the Aegira head and the Sardanopolos type is the formation of the beard which on the latter hangs in a rather stringy and fluid mass than on the former. In all probability the Sardanopolos type is a late Classical or early Hellenistic prototype which uses an earlier bearded portrayal of Dionysos as a model. Madigan would restore the Aegira head with a chiton and himation, which for a representation of the god that re-used Archaic elements would be appropriate.

Further evidence of the combined iconography of the two gods at Aegira is to be found in the decoration of the temple, as on the floor of the cella a mosaic was unearthed showing an eagle and a snake in combat. Such imagery could be suggestive of the conflict between the ideologies of the two deities who were neither mutually exclusive or independent entities. Decorative motifs on the mosaic also indicate Dionysian symbols, such as kantharoi, griffins and thyrsos and these emblems have little to do with the cult and rites of Zeus.⁴⁰ Furthermore, as Madigan points out, this building could not have accommodated both the statue of Zeus and the chryselephantine statue of Athena which Pausanias informs us stood next to her father. All the evidence strongly suggests that Naiskos D at Aegira was in fact a shrine of Dionysos, but we can not rule out that Zeus also played an important part in the cult in both the symbolism of the mosaic and in the form and appearance of the cult statue.

This leads to the question of technique. Pausanias, when recording the statue of Zeus at Aegira, claims that the figure was constructed out of one piece of Pentelic marble.⁴¹ The Aegira head and arm, however, are probably from an acrolithic statue instead, further evidence for this not being the Zeus. The Aegira Dionysos possibly had wooden drapery and was perhaps gilded, and possibly draped in the manner of the Sardanopolos statue, that is in heavy robes. If the seated figure did display archaizing trends then the god may have been shown with both arms outstretched at the elbow, carrying a thyrsos or sceptres.⁴² The preserved left hand of the statue clutches a thick, cylindrical object and,

⁴⁰ Madigan, 1991,507.

⁴¹ Pausanias, 7,26,4.

⁴² Seated, Archaic figures of deities often hold out both hands, sometimes carrying objects or else as a means of appearing approachable.

as Madigan suggests, this is the remains of the stem of a thyrsos rather than a sceptre which Zeus would normally hold. The only difficulty with this restoration is the angle in which the stem rests in the hand. If the left arm was held away from the body and raised, as the compressed bicep would suggest, the thyrsos would have pointed outwards and not rested on the ground. The only solution to this problem is that the arm may have been lowered with the forearm outstretched thus positioning the thyrsos over Dionysos' lap, an unusual place for the object, but not out of the question.

It remains to assess the date of the Aegira cult image of Dionysos and, since its attribution to Eukleides has been removed, there is perhaps scope to re-date the piece. The historical circumstances of Aegira as one of the cities of the Achaean League should have dissuaded earlier scholars from placing the head too late in the second century B.C. By this date the League had been dissolved and was politically weakened, but it could be argued that once the city of Aegira re-gained its political independence that civic pride may have manifested itself in a new and ambitious building programme. This is possible, but could the city financially afford such an expensive project so late in its life and without the prestige of being a member of the League? With its political decline we might reasonably expect an economic decline. So perhaps we should look towards an earlier date. Archaeological and architectural evidence may be of use here and, as Madigan points out, the style of the mosaic in Naikos D appears third century in date. The nearby theatre complex also dates to this century and was probably closely tied up with the temple of Dionysos, the sanctuary of the god in Athens being an earlier and fine parallel. So perhaps the figure belongs to the third century B.C. On the whole, however, the aforementioned stylistic parallels date to the first half of the second century B.C. and it

seems reasonable to suggest a date not earlier than about 200 B.C. Stewart attempted to parallel the head with terracotta figures from the Athenian Agora.⁴³ These two fragmentary bearded heads show a similar voluminous beard, but their small scale and lack of detail preclude them from being reliable dating mechanisms. In any case Stewart believed the Aegira head was a Zeus and the work of Eukleides whose style, he claims, had shaken off the last vestiges of the Baroque and was academic classicism, but this is inaccurate.

Surprisingly, Madigan would see the temple empty, or containing an earlier image, for about a century, as he dates the head to the mid second century, and categorises the piece alongside the Pheneos Hygieia and the Athena Polias at Priene as classicising acrolithic cult images. He continues to suggest that the Aegira statue imitated the famous chryselephantine image by Alkamenes in Athens, the original appearance of which is only preserved on coins. Classical coins, however, show variations in their portrayal of the famous cult image and are of little help in restoring details or determining whether the Aegira statue was a later variant of Alkamenes' statue.⁴⁴ Overall, this desire to categorise second century sculpture on mainland Greece as classicising should be eliminated and, as Smith points out, the cult statues were only following traditional methods of representing the deities in sculptures serving a ritual function. The sculptors were not consciously attempting to revive earlier styles.⁴⁵

⁴³ Stewart, 1979,51.

⁴⁴ For an illustration of these coins see Waldstein, 1926,160.

⁴⁵ Smith, 1991,240.

Lastly Madigan proposes that we should look towards the Guilds of Dionysos as the source of funding for the statue. The Guilds donated money towards the running costs and embellishment of sanctuaries and may well have contributed towards the cost of a new cult statue, and the colossal scale and rich embellishment of the statue at Aegira would have required a great deal of money. This is all speculative, but it is feasible that the guilds were responsible for the financing of the sanctuary and theatre complex.

In conclusion, the cult image of Dionysos at Aegira was of unusual form for the Hellenistic period. The bearded type, so popular in the Archaic and early Classical periods was re-used, and may have been influenced by the statue by Alkamenes, but was carved in a thoroughly up-to-date manner with hints of the dynamic styles prevalent in Asia Minor, but also being practised by mainland Greek sculptors such as Damophon, as his Antyos reveals. The head of Dionysos was richly furnished in marble, metal and possibly gold attachments and the eyes were inlaid with some precious stone. With these additions, the whole effect of the colossal image in its small temple must have been overwhelming. The Aegira Dionysos ranks amongst some of the most powerful cult statues of the Olympian gods from any period of Greek sculpture.

For the latter half of the century, Dionysos had no great temples built for his cult. Only one statue of the god is recorded. It stood in his temple at Boura in Achaia and was the work of Eukleides, but little is known of its appearance other than it was made of Pentelic marble.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Pausanias, 7.25.9.

To conclude that the cult images of Dionysos either followed similar basic types or were innovative has been almost impossible to demonstrate using the surviving sculptures. It is frustrating that so many original Hellenistic sculptures of Dionysos exist, yet so few come from temple settings. Where the iconography of the god certainly was developed was in the choregic monuments where the figures blended Apolline features with Dionysian femininity and a slight eroticism. The god had the sensuous forms of Hellenistic Aphrodites, the cumbersome drapery of the Muses and sometimes the serious, bearded features of Zeus.

Chapter Six

Apollo and Artemis

The cults of both Apollo and Artemis, and their mother Leto, thrived during the Hellenistic period all over Greece, Asia Minor and further east. Numerous temples were erected for their worship and they are some of the largest of all temples constructed during the period. Furthermore, several important fragments of their cult images survive including the magnificent group from the temple at Klaros. Many of the major cult statues of the period can also be identified on coins, but these are often the most obscure of the cult statues, portrayals of which vary according to the date in which the coin was issued. Another important element of this section is that some of the cult statues can be attributed to famous master sculptors such as Bryaxis the younger and Damophon. The location of the Apollo by Bryaxis at Antioch lies just outside the geographical confines of this study but its notoriety renders it an important element of this section. Another important Hellenistic piece is the Tralleis Apollo which also generated later versions such as the Cyrene Apollo. The mother of the two deities plays a significant role in this section in that she is represented in the Klaros group and had her own temple at Xanthos in Lycia. The three deities had been portrayed together as a group in the Archaic and Classical periods, but little is known about these cult groups.

The Late Classical Forerunners

As subjects for late Classical master sculptors the importance of Apollo, Artemis, and to a lesser extent Leto, cannot be overestimated. Praxiteles carved many cult images of these three deities for sanctuaries in mainland Greece, including images of all three at Megara

and Mantinea, a marble Apollo which was later to be found in Rome and the bronze image of Apollo Sauroktonos which is known from later Roman copies.¹ The sculptor also carved two cult images of Artemis, at Antikyra in Phokis and Artemis Brauronia on the Athenian Acropolis and also a statue of Leto at Argos. Two statues of Apollo are recorded for the sculptor Leochares, one outside the temple of Apollo Patroos in Athens and a bronze statue.² Skopas was responsible for two equally famous cult images of Apollo, at Rhamnous and in the temple of Apollo Smintheus at Chryse in the Troad as well as a statue of Artemis in her temple at Thebes.³ Attempts have been made to link surviving copies with many of these late Classical masterpieces, and, owing to the notoriety of many of the cult images, it is reasonable to expect that they were copied. Flashar has recently investigated statues belonging to the Apollo Kitharoidos type, bringing together many originals and copies, with relevant examples referred to throughout this section.⁴ One of the most important of his catalogued pieces is the Apollo Patroos by Euphranor, which survives in original form and is best dated to the period 340 - 330 B.C.⁵ This colossal and headless statue forms an interesting prototype which was followed throughout the Hellenistic period and will be an important element in understanding types used for Apollo's cult images, but its date falls outside the period under discussion. This particular image, however, is of fundamental importance in the analysis of one of Apollo's earliest and most famous of cult images, that at Daphne near the Seleukid capital of Antioch.

¹ See Stewart, 1990, 278 for a list of the works of Praxiteles.

² For the Athenian statue see Pausanias 1,3,4. Pliny informs us of the bronze statue, NH,34,79.

³ The Rhamnous statue was later taken to Rome, Pliny NH,36,25-26. Strabo informs us of the Troad statue, 13,1,48 and for the Artemis see Pausanias, 10,17,1.

⁴ Flashar, 1992.

⁵ This figure now stands in the Stoa of Attalos, Athens, S2134. Euphranor also created a group of Apollo, Artemis and Leto in bronze which was later taken to Rome, Pliny NH,34,77-78.

The Early Hellenistic Period

During this period several of Apollo and Artemis' sanctuaries were developed, though none have yielded actual fragments of their cult images. At Epidauros, the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas was re-furbished, but we know little of its form of the cult image.⁶ At Epidauros also, a small temple to Artemis was built in the late fourth century, but again nothing is known about its cult image. Fortunately at this time, the construction of two gigantic temples were begun in honour of Apollo at Didyma and of Artemis at Sardis. Owing to the colossal proportions of these two structures, they were built in several stages over the next few centuries, and both temples remained unfinished in terms of architectural refinements. Unfortunately, as in the case of most major Hellenistic temples, the cult images from Didyma and Sardis do not survive. What is certain, however, is that the new temple at Didyma housed an ancient cult image, of Apollo Philesis, *the Affectionate*, which was reportedly the work of the Archaic sculptor Kanachos of Sikyon. This was placed within the small naiskos in the cella. Coins from Miletos show the standing god, holding a stag in his outstretched right hand and a bow in his left. The Hellenistic temple was begun about 300 B.C., with its early stages probably funded, or at least initiated, by Seleukos I who had restored the ancient cult image to the sanctuary after it was taken to Ekbatana by Darios. Because, however, the statue is of an earlier date, there is no point dwelling on the appearance and significance of the cult image here. From Sardis the picture is more illuminating, though somewhat more complicated as will

⁶ Investigations at the site are continuing today and may reveal the architectural history of the site more clearly.

be explained shortly. But the earliest Hellenistic cult image which we have information about is that of Apollo at Antioch by Bryaxis .

The Apollo Pytheios Daphneios at Daphne

Perhaps the most famous of all Apollo's cult images in the Hellenistic world stood in his temple at Daphne, near Antioch, the capital of the Seleukid empire. The statue does not survive, but its fame and its appearance is attested by numerous references in ancient literature. In addition to this, the cult image is well documented on coinage and is also possibly reproduced in small scale marble figures. As with other celebrated cult statues, which can only be reconstructed by descriptions and possible representations on other materials, we must be cautious not to attempt to dwell on the style of the statue. What is more important is to discover the general appearance of the figure and its historical and archaeological context. One of the most contentious issues surrounding the cult image, however, concerns its sculptor.

The name Bryaxis is only associated with the statue by a very late source.⁷ The confusion lies in whether this is the late Classical sculptor, who worked on the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos, or a later sculptor of that name. Pollitt believes that the dedication of the statue, in the early years of Seleukos I's reign, does not necessarily mean that the Apollo was made specifically for that temple.⁸ He claims that it may have been taken to Daphne from another location and re-dedicated. This is of course possible, but one

⁷ See the reference in Stewart, 1990,300.

⁸ Pollitt, 1986,279.

wonders why the Seleukid king would not commission a new image for the great temple, but instead be satisfied with a second hand cult statue. A possible argument against such an hypothesis is that it would have been a difficult task to transport statues made in the acrolithic technique; the figure would need to be taken apart to remove it from its place of origin.

If Pollitt is to be believed, then the intention may have been to antique the cult by introducing an older and already venerated cult statue. Yet then we would expect either a much earlier cult statue to have been utilised or an archaising one to have been commissioned, examples of which were dedicated at Pergamon. Furthermore, a sculptor named Bryaxis was employed to produce the colossal cult image of Sarapis at Alexandria by Ptolemy I, which seems best dated to the later fourth century or early third. The most likely solution is that we are in fact dealing with a different Bryaxis to the one who worked on the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos.

The literary record is an invaluable source of evidence for the appearance of the Apollo at Daphne. The writer Philostorgios, who is our best source for the appearance of the statue, tells us that the statue was acrolithic, with the head and extremities made of marble and the body of wood.⁹ Apollo's robes were gilded and he wore a gold, laurel crown, and he also held a kithara in his left hand and a phiale in his right. One of the most stunning features of the statue was its eyes which were inlaid with violet stones. Furthermore, the figure was about the same height as the seated Zeus at Olympia, thus our largest recorded cult image of Apollo from the Hellenistic period. The colossal figure was accompanied by

⁹ See Stewart, 1990,300, T148 for this source.

the Muses and also portraits of the dedicator Seleukos and his son. The whole assembly must have been a spectacular sight and the group's destruction by fire in 362 A.D. is the subject of a lamentation by Libanios.¹⁰ From such a celebrated cult statue we may perhaps expect reproductions, or variations of, at least the Apollo, if not the Muses, but perhaps our best source for the appearance of Bryaxis' image is to be found in coinage.

Coins issued during the reign of Antiochos IV are the earliest which show this colossal statue and, although they reproduce the ancient descriptions faithfully, they can do nothing but hint at the original beauty of the Apollo (figs. 123-124). The god stands in profile, with the weight on his left leg, whilst his right is slightly bent. He wears a laurel crown which secured much of his hair within its band, but some long locks hang loosely over his shoulders. He wears a long, high girdled chiton which covers most of his body, but only reveals the tips of his right foot. Over this is draped an himation with a large overfold of material, which covers his right shoulder and then hangs behind him in deeply folded pleats. The coins seem to show that his right, outstretched arm was not covered in material and presumably was made of ivory. The figure is very conservative in design, but whether it was based on a Classical prototype is impossible to ascertain from the limited evidence. Yet this stationary pose is to be expected in a figure of such colossal dimensions and constructed out of different materials. If Bryaxis did select an earlier cult image as a model, the only surviving figure which could have been a blueprint for the Daphne Apollo is that by Euphranor, already mentioned, which preserves the same pose, drapery arrangement and which also functioned as Apollo Kitharoidos. The Daphne Apollo, however, is conceived on a much grander scale and was a much more expensive

¹⁰ For this account see Pollitt, 1990,91-2.

dedication to the god. More will be said of its dedication and historical context shortly but it is important now to consider the proposed reproductions of the Daphne cult image.

Many Hellenistic and Roman statuettes and figures of Apollo Kitharoidos on reliefs, show a similarly draped statue, with a long chiton, and a large sweep of material from the himation over the shoulders. Flashar illustrates many figures that he suggests were inspired by Bryaxis' statue.¹¹ The figures do indeed all reflect the same general type as the Daphne Apollo, but differ in one respect; the chiton has a much shorter overfold than on the colossal acrolith. Admittedly the portrayal of the Daphne Apollo on coinage shows minor variations of the length of the chiton, some showing it reaching the god's feet while others show a long, ankle length overfold. Furthermore the reduced scale variants differ from each other in minor, but still distinct, details. There is no time here to discuss these variations in design, but what is evident is that they probably reproduce various statues of the long-robed Kitharoidos types. This is suggested by the fact that these reproductions are found all over the Greek world. The statue at Daphne would have probably been internationally famous, but not necessarily the only cult image of its type available as a model. We cannot of course rule out the possibility that the cult image by Bryaxis did generate numerous reproductions in miniature and on reliefs, but to distinguish these from original small scale Kitharoidos types and copies of other Hellenistic cult images would be an arduous, and frankly, pointless task.

¹¹ Flashar, 1992, figs 46-60.

One possible reproduction of the cult image at Daphne is on a relief in Istanbul.¹² The upper register shows a draped man and a child standing by an altar, in front of which stands an animal which may be a dog. On the other side stands a taller, headless figure of Apollo, draped in long robes, holding a kithara in his left hand and a phiale in his right. The god appears to pour a libation onto what is presumably his own altar. What is interesting about the figure of the god is that we see it from a frontal position rather than in profile, as on the coins. If this relief does show the Daphne Apollo, then its sculptor adapted the figure both to suit the sculpted panel and the scene portrayed. Comparisons between the cult image and the relief are the long, highly girdled tunic which falls over the god's feet and the attributes which he holds. But there are many differences also, for instance the kithara is held at a low angle on the relief and the weight is borne on the right and not the left leg as on the coins of Antiochos IV. The inscription on the relief describes the god as Apollo Krateanos and therefore the figure may have been inspired by a specific cult image which stood elsewhere. If the relief, and the many other variations of the general Kitharoidos type, were inspired by the Daphne Apollo the sculptors did not attempt to reproduce the image precisely. Again we must envisage a situation where the cult image at Daphne was not accessible to all and reproductions of it may have been based on memory, or more likely, word of mouth. Therefore, apart from the usually very poetic descriptions we possess of the cult statue, there is very little to go on.

The most comprehensive account of the cult image at Daphne is Linfert's study. He, like Flashar, gathered together possible small scale reproductions of the Apollo of both

¹² For an illustration see Flashar, 1992, fig 46. Istanbul Archaeological Museum, Inv.1593.

Hellenistic and Roman date.¹³ Most of these "copies" tend to be of small scale and of average quality, but could indeed have been inspired by the famous cult image. A statuette of Roman date at Worlitz preserves the same general pose and attributes as Bryaxis' statue, apart from the right arm which is lowered instead of raised.¹⁴ Another figure from Delos also has the right arm lowered. In fact very few of the proposed reproductions by Linfert retain the exact posture of the original at Daphne. On a more positive note, however, the author does make intriguing suggestions for a possible copy of one of the Muses which stood with the Apollo as an integral part of the cult group.

A colossal marble figure of Melpomene in the Louvre is certainly a reproduction of about the same time and in the same style as the Daphne Apollo.¹⁵ The head is the least informative as it is rather bland in appearance and classicising in style. The draped torso, however, has a high belt, a long sleeved tunic which flares out below the belt in vertical sharply cut folds which are reminiscent of the Apollo on the coins. This Muse may well be a later copy of one of the Daphne Muses but there is really no way of verifying such a claim. What is important here is that we must visualise the temple at Daphne as containing at least ten cult images which formed a group with a central Apollo serving as both Kitharoidos as well as Apollo Musagetes. It is a group that is difficult to visualise, with the inadequate evidence.

¹³ Linfert, 1983, 165-173, plates 42-47.

¹⁴ Linfert, 1983, plate 43c.

¹⁵ See Linfert, 1983, plates 45-47. Louvre 411. Linfert claims that the small bundle of drapery under the right shoulder is a device commonly found in sculpture of the early third century but does not clearly explain his reasons or give parallels.

All that remains is the historical significance of the Apollo by Bryaxis, a statue which is difficult to accurately locate amongst later copies or variants, yet clearly recognisable on coins. The historical circumstances surrounding the dedication of the temple and cult image at Daphne seem obvious at first. The site of the sanctuary was supposedly where Daphne transformed herself into the laurel tree after rejecting Apollo's amorous advances. Daphne was also a site of great natural beauty with luscious, freshwater springs, the proximity of which were often a major feature in the choice of location for Apollo's shrines, namely the oracular sites of Delphi and Didyma which allegedly had sacred springs in the cellas of the temples. The Daphne sanctuary was further enriched by a grove of sacred cypress trees. Libanios informs us of the myth behind the temple's location. The story goes that Seleukos chose Daphne after divine direction by Apollo himself and that it was a site of special affection of the god. The myth also highlights the propaganda surrounding the origin of the Seleukid dynasty, who claimed direct descent from Apollo himself, thereby claiming rights to their kingdom and endeavouring to legitimise their rule. Furthermore, the area of western Asia Minor under the influence of Selukos I contained two of the most eminent sanctuaries of Apollo, at Miletos and, more importantly, Didyma. One of the king's most remarkable feats was to return the sacred xoanon of Apollo to the Didyma temple, which must have caused renewed interest in the cult and probably generated the ambitious reconstruction of the temple there. In fact Seleukos helped to finance the earliest phase of the temple, a generous gesture which resulted in portraits of himself and his first wife Apama being set up inside the temple. Thus Seleukos I patronised and revived the cults of Apollo at the site of the most important Ionian oracular shrine and possibly at Miletos also, where improvements were made to the sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios in the early Hellenistic period. There is no

evidence to suggest that the sanctuary of Apollo at Daphne functioned as an oracle, but it is not surprising that the most celebrated of all the new shrines near the city of Antioch was dedicated to the god. What is interesting, however, is that the cult image of Apollo by Bryaxis was not commissioned to appear as an ancient idol like the Apollo at Didyma. The Daphne statue was thoroughly modern in its appearance and the group included the Muses, who were not part of the main repertoire for large scale sculptures until the late Classical period but only really acquired their plastic identities during the Hellenistic period.

To conclude then, the image by Bryaxis, a sculptor whom we know only through tentatively identified copies of his Serapis, is an enigmatic work. In the very nature of their simplicity, the coins can only exhibit a general outline of any cult image portrayed and we cannot comprehend the physical beauty of the cult image from them. With all of the additional materials used to form this acrolithic and gilded figure, the Apollo must have been a spectacular sight indeed. He stood on a colossal scale and was not alone, but joined by his entourage. He was the god of music and the arts, but the cult image had wider political implications. This promotion of cults by the Seleukos I is further highlighted by his involvement in the architectural development of the sanctuary of Artemis at Sardis in Lydia.

The Artemis at Sardis

The temple at Sardis has already been mentioned in the section concerning the cult image of Zeus, but it was Artemis who was the principal deity of the city. There were several

construction phases of the colossal temple. It was planned on a gigantic scale some time after the city's liberation from Persian domination by Alexander the Great, but it has been reasonably suggested that the building work did not commence until around 281 B.C. when the Seleukid monarchy were assuming control over western Asia Minor. At this stage only the pronaos, cella and opisthodomos were constructed, but enough had been built to shelter a cult image. When the work on the temple resumed is a matter of debate, with Hanfmann suggesting that the cella was divided during the period of Achaïos's influence in about 221 B.C. when the cult statue of Zeus was added.¹⁶ This would suggest that the cult image of Artemis was already in place in the west cella and perhaps dedicated shortly after the first stage of the building was complete. The controversy really lies in whether the cella was divided before the second century A.D. when statues of Antoninus Pius and Faustina were placed in the temple. The colossal fragment of the cult statue of Zeus has already been dated to the last quarter of the third century B.C. on stylistic grounds and its association with the Seleukid Achaïos has been outlined. Perhaps the most logical conclusion is that the statues of the Antonine sovereigns were added to the temple next to the statues of Artemis and Zeus, in their respective parts of the two cellas. The question, however, must remain open until further investigations at the site determine the architectural history in more detail.

What is important here is to recover evidence for the Hellenistic cult statue of the Artemis and, unfortunately, there is little to go on, which is surprising when one considers how significant and influential the cult of Artemis at Sardis was. Further confusion arises from the coinage which was issued, on the whole, in the Roman period, which depict, not the

¹⁶ See section on Zeus from Sardis.

Artemis, but an archaizing and Anatolian cult statue of Kore.¹⁷ The figure is in the manner of the Ephesian Artemis, Artemis Leukophryene and the Aphrodite from Aphrodisias. The hieratic statue is heavily draped, holding both forearms outstretched and wearing a high polos on her head. Pomegranates and sheaves of corn are shown around the figure, which are symbols of the goddess Kore/Persephone, or at least a more ancient goddess associated with that deity. Fleischer claimed that this was the Artemis of Sardis assimilated with Kore.¹⁸ This identification was also accepted by Price and Trel. Hanfmann does not agree and believes that an earlier cult statue showed a standing Artemis wearing a polos and a long veil.¹⁹ He continues to describe the possible Hellenistic cult image on coins, as an unveiled classicising and rococco figure of the second century B.C. This is perhaps too late a date for the cult image and his stylistic classification is too particular for a profile head on a coin. This may of course depict a different statue in the city. This leaves us with the problem that the cult image of Artemis was not as prominent on later coins as the Kore; something we might have expected for the most celebrated cult image in the city. Maybe at Sardis they were both regarded as the offspring of Kybele, an Anatolian goddess also associated with Demeter, who relinquished the sanctuary to the Olympian Artemis when the city became Hellenised after Alexander's liberation. Artemis, as we have already seen at Lykosoura was, in certain cults, the daughter of Demeter, and in any case was also a fertility goddess. It is important to note here how Artemis was perhaps the goddess who united the Olympian gods with the old eastern deities in the recently Hellenised cities of Asia Minor. Her function as a nature deity also had earthly and fertility connotations, a function which

¹⁷ Price and Trel, 1977, 137, figs.240-242.

¹⁸ Fleischer, 1973,191-2.

¹⁹ Hanfmann 1983, 129.

would have rendered her cult more popular in terms of Hellenistic religious beliefs. Furthermore in the cult images of Asia Minor, Artemis often retained an iconography that was wholly non-Greek in character. These Anatolian style cult statues probably became popular due to the Artemis at Ephesos where this method of amalgamating deities pictorially was perhaps revived in the late Classical period. The Ephesian Artemis was also worshipped at Sardis and if a new cult image of Artemis of Sardis was placed in the new Hellenistic temple, she may have been inspired by the recently dedicated Ephesos statue; that is in an ancient Anatolian style. This is all speculative and the lack of any evidence renders a reconstruction of any theoretical Hellenistic cult image impossible. So there is little evidence surviving from which to reconstruct the Artemis from Sardis.

For the middle half of the third century there is very little information concerning the cult images of Apollo or Artemis. Towards the end of the century, however, two extremely important and large temples were built, which may or may not have had predecessors. At Klaros, the oracle underwent a revival during this period and a great temple was constructed containing three enormous cult figures. At Magnesia on the Maeander, the cult of Artemis Leukophryene was also revitalised and a new temple raised in her honour.

Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia on the Maeander

The colossal temple to Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia on the Maeander was designed by the architect Hermogenes, probably some time in the last quarter of the third century B.C. The stylobate measures 67.0 x 47.0 metres, and it was an Ionic, pseudo - dipteros temple with 8 x 15 columns. The outline of the cult image base can be located between

the two rear columns of the cella and it was almost square in shape and large enough to accommodate a figure of considerable size. The temple was traditionally dated to the mid second century B.C., but recently opinions have changed and an earlier dating has been almost unanimously accepted for the dedication of the temple and presumably its cult statue.²⁰ An inscription mentions the revival of the festival of the goddess which took place in the years 221 - 220 B.C. and this would be an appropriate moment for dedicating the new temple of the goddess and may have also been when a new cult image was erected in the temple. The problem lies in whether there was an earlier cult statue of Artemis and, if this is so, was it placed inside the Hellenistic temple ?

The development of the cult of Artemis Leucophryene at Magnesia is explained in detail by Farnell, who claims that either Artemis dethroned or, more likely, was assimilated with Kybele who had been worshipped at Magnesia previously.²¹ There is, however, very little historical detail concerning the later cult of Artemis, the only relevant information is that derived from coins from Magnesia where the goddess is depicted bearing a striking resemblance to the Artemis of Ephesos. The first known representation of the statue is dated to about 190 B.C., not long after its dedication. The coins vary slightly in their details but in general the Artemis is shown standing in a strictly hieratic position with a cylindrical body, which on certain coins appears to be sectioned and tapering to a narrow point where her feet stand closely together. Her arms lie close to her body, but the forearms are outstretched and are entwined with what appears to be wool according to Fleischer.²² She wears a high polos, around which hover two Nikai. A possible marble

²⁰ See Ridgway, 1990, 155.

²¹ Farnell, 1896, 403.

²² Fleischer, 1973, 141.

copy in Rome suggests that these were probably part of the original and not a device added by the die cutter.²³ The marble version survives only in a fragment consisting of the remains of the polos, a hollow where the head was attached and parts of two winged Nikai. At the back of the head, remains of drapery show that she was not veiled but that her himation was pulled over her head. The lack of the head, which has not been broken from the hollow, but was added separately, perhaps suggest that the original statue was pieced together. It may have been acrolithic and the face carved in ivory or another material. This is speculative, but for such an important cult image, the use of precious materials in its manufacture should not be ruled out. Apart from this information little can be gleaned from this marble copy.

To restore most of the figure we must return to the coinage. Her hands rest on two long stands at the base of which stand creatures of some sort. An exact identification of these beasts is difficult, but they may be eagles, as seen on a coin of Nero showing the cult statue in its temple (fig. 126). The iconography is unusual to say the least and the variations in design are confusing. Yet the coins do seem to all agree on one matter, that the Artemis was in the Anatolian style and probably that revived at Ephesos: a modern cult image but revealing the ancient identity of an eastern fertility goddess, not the Olympian goddess. One interesting element of the coin portrayal is that the facial features seem not to be rendered. The head is large and round but no features are evident. Whether this was part of the original cult statue is doubtful, but the problem emphasises the dilemma of the cult image. In many respects the Artemis is closely related to the Ephesian goddess, though more accurate marble versions of this latter image provide us

²³ For an illustration of this copy see Fleischer, 1973, plate 61a&b.

with more information. The Magnesia statue is still a mystery in terms of its exact appearance, the method of its construction and the materials used and furthermore, the date of its dedication. As with the other possible Anatolian style, fertility goddess cult statues of the region, at Ephesos, possibly at Sardis, the images retain elements of earlier representations of the deities concerned. We are not dealing with the Olympian Artemis, whose iconography is usually easily recognisable. Although such cult statues cannot be ignored in this study, the lack of conclusive evidence is unsatisfactory. Equally frustrating is the difficulty in relating these images with other cult statues of the Hellenistic period. Fortunately at Klaros, the cult image of Artemis showed the goddess in her usual Hellenistic attire, in the Olympian rather than Anatolian guise.

The Klaros Group (catalogue number 15), figs. 48-54

Of all the cult images and groups detailed in this study, the group at Klaros in western Asia Minor is the most controversial. The cult images require a thorough examination, but this is still not possible as the remains of the statues remain in situ at the temple site.²⁴ The colossal fragments of the three main cult figures can be viewed at the site, but cannot be understood entirely until they are reconstructed and presented in a more organised arrangement. This poses several problems as the main bone of contention rests on whether the sculptures are of Hellenistic or Roman date. Several scholars have attempted to determine the date of the surviving pieces of the statues but only provide inferior photographs of the sculptures which are inadequate to form any kind of stylistic

²⁴ The colossal fragments of Apollo, Artemis and Leto still await publication but renewed excavations at the site include the intention to gather the sculptures together for study.

analysis. On the whole, however, those who dismiss the group as Hadrianic in date do not discuss the style or physical appearance of the statues.²⁵ Linfert and Flashar date the cult images to the Hellenistic period using stylistic comparisons, the former suggesting an early second century date and the latter, a late third century origin.²⁶ If this is the case, then the group ranks alongside the Lykosoura cult images, which are of similar date, as the most complete groups of cult statues which survive from Greek contexts. Furthermore, in terms of scale, the Klaros group is one of the largest of all surviving Hellenistic cult groups. So to define their chronological context is the most important consideration here and this will be attempted after their architectural and archaeological context has been examined.

The site of Klaros was not a city site but, like Didyma, was a sanctuary controlled by its nearest large city. Miletos pulled the strings at Didyma and for Klaros, Kolophon was the dominant city over its affairs and management. The site was probably sacred to Apollo from an early date but there are no references to its oracular function until the early Hellenistic period. The temple, that was excavated by the French in the 1950s, is a Doric peripteros, 46 x 26 metres with 11 x 6 columns, but much of the building is a Hadrianic reconstruction of an earlier, Hellenistic structure. The exact form of the temple and its later, Hadrianic restoration, is still unclear. Fortunately, French archaeologists are now studying the sanctuary in detail. The temple was accompanied by a huge altar, measuring 18.5 x 9 metres and was dedicated to both Apollo and Dionysos. Artemis had her own,

²⁵ See Parke, 1985, 134 and present director of the excavations, de la Geniere, who suggests that they may be Roman in date but that the question must remain open until further examination has taken place, *pers.corr.* 11/11/92.

²⁶ Linfert, 1976, 62; Özgan, 1982, 204 and Flashar, 1992, 152

much earlier, Archaic temple to the south of the Hellenistic structure, which suggests that Apollo too may have had an earlier temple, though no obvious trace survives beneath the later building. Until more is known about the interior of the temple it is difficult to restore the three, colossal cult figures to their original position and to assess their visual impact within the cella. It is feasible, however, to reconstruct the group from the marble fragments still resting on the site and from coins.

The group as a whole

The three statues which formed the elements of the cult group at Klaros need to be examined as a whole before their individual characteristics and styles are evaluated. Like the Lykosoura group, which functioned as a complete unit, with the central figures dominating the scene and the ancillary figures framing the composition, so the Klaros group had a design and form which can be reconstructed using both the sculptural remains and the evidence from coins.

Coins issued by the city of Kolophon vary in their portrayal of the cult images but only in terms of how much of the group they depict. Apollo is either shown alone, seated inside his temple, or accompanied by Artemis and Leto as part of the group. One of the most informative coins is one from the reign of Caracalla (fig. 126), where Apollo is shown seated on a throne and facing to his right towards a standing figure of Artemis who turns towards him. Behind Apollo stands Leto who also turns to face her son. Apollo is seated with his left arm resting on a lyre and his right extended, his hand holding a spray of bay leaves. It is interesting that the designer of the group did not show Apollo sitting frontally

facing the spectator, but instead the intimacy between the individual figures is shown by the two goddesses who turn towards the central figure of the god. Furthermore, the seated figure of Apollo is as tall as the two standing goddesses and the extant fragments of the Apollo show that he was carved on a larger scale. The fact that he was seated, however, would have made this less obvious; a device that we also found at Lykosoura where the central, seated figures were constructed on a larger scale than the flanking statues. The fact that the sanctuary at Klaros functioned as an oracle would suggest the god's prominent role and where the two goddesses fit in with this cult is uncertain. Yet we should not rely heavily on the representation of the Klaros group on coins as the design is destined to appear unsatisfactory by the very nature of their simplicity.

The second important consideration here is the technique and construction of the group, and enough fragments of each figure survive to assess the assemblage of the individual statues. The portion which preserves the draped right knee of Apollo is not carved fully in the round but where the leg met the throne the surface is flat and was originally attached to the throne by dowels.²⁷ On the Artemis, the lower part of the drapery has been damaged and does not preserve a surface for the securing of the lower portion and the upper break does not indicate whether the head was inserted, as in the case of the Leto which has a socket for the insertion of the head which presumably was carved in one piece with the tenon. The arms of the Artemis were separately carved, however, and attached to the torso and were uncovered as the coins confirm. The piecing together of such colossal portions of marble required great proficiency and, like Damophon's group at Lykosoura, the sculptor was a skilled engineer as well as a stone carver. This mastery of

²⁷ For a diagram of the seated Apollo see Flashar, 1992, fig.124.

marble is evident not only in the construction of the group but also in the powerful, yet sensitive modelling of the individual statues. To arrive at any conclusions concerning the style and more importantly the date of the Klaros group, requires an analysis of the surviving fragments of sculpture.

The Apollo

The recent and welcome account by Flashar, of the iconography of Apollo Kitharoidos, included an interesting and perceptive analysis of the Klarian Apollo. His conclusions, however, are based more on coin representations and possible reproductions of the statue in other forms than on the actual surviving fragments. His reconstructed Apollo sits on an a throne holding a kithara in his right hand and a laurel branch in his outstretched left, and he is crowned with a laurel wreath (fig. 48). He is draped only in an himation which covers his waist and thighs then falls to his feet, while his upper torso is bare. This compares well with the coins and uses the extant fragment of the figure in an uncomplicated manner. One fragment of a figure still in situ on the site, however, appears lacking in Flashar's image, that being a large fragment of an arm, which was attributed to the Apollo by Bean.²⁸ This colossal fragment cannot, however, be easily assigned to this seated figure, or indeed be identified as part of an arm and may, instead, be part of a draped leg from one of the female figures. Representations of the statue on coins show the left, naked arm of Apollo in a slightly different position to Flashar's suggested reconstruction, with it resting on his lap but still holding the laurel branch.

²⁸ Bean, 1989 (reprint), 158.

As for the position of the legs, more can be determined from the surviving fragments. Portions of both draped legs exist, the left knee preserving the deeply carved folds of the himation which stretches between the knees. The left leg was drawn behind the right and the foot raised up slightly onto its toes. Where the material hangs loosely in front of the left lower leg the channels are deeply grooved but at the sides the himation reveals the contours of the calf muscle. The material then hangs as far as the raised left foot of which a large fragment survives. The rendering of the drapery folds certainly appears Hellenistic in style and compares well with the seated statue of Zeus from Magnesia on the Maeander and a seated philosopher also found at Klaros.²⁹ The parallels are convincing but a closer date for the group will be determined shortly.

Apart from the deep channelling between the folds of the himation the foot may help us to determine the date of the statue. On the one preserved sandal, there is a break where we would expect the typically high Hellenistic indented sole, but his footwear is not easily paralleled and is not much of much help in defining the date of the figure. What can be deduced is that the workmanship was of excellent quality, which is particularly surprising when the scale of the statue is considered. This sandal, with its high sole, resembles those worn by the Muses and other statues of the Apollo Kitharoidos. The most obvious parallel is with a seated statue of the god which may have originally been the Apollo of the east pediment of the late Classical temple at Delphi.³⁰ The two statues have a similar posture, drapery arrangement and attributes, namely a kithara. It is unlikely that the Klarian Apollo was directly influenced by the Delphi figure, but the inspiration may have

²⁹ For this figure see Özgan, 1982, 204.

³⁰ See Flashar, 1992, figs 88-89.

come from the three pedimental statues of Apollo, Artemis and Leto. The style of the statues is, of course different and it will be made clear later that the Leto was definitely not a reproduction of a late Classical prototype.

Flashar also compares the Klarian Apollo with a figure on a relief found at Didyma, another oracular site in western Asia Minor. The relief shows a seated Apollo with his sister and mother standing on either side of him.³¹ The author dates the relief to no later than 150 B.C. Admittedly the three figures preserve similar postures to the Klaros group but there are many differences. The Apollo turns the other way and it is unclear how he is draped. He also rests his right hand on the rock on which he is seated and he sits in a more relaxed position. The way in which the female figure on his right, perhaps Artemis, is draped is similar to the fragment of the Klarian Artemis but she stands in a more relaxed manner. On the whole the three figures on the relief are far too worn to compare to the representations of the Klaros cult group, and furthermore, the Klaros figures betray an animated movement not evident in the composed figures on the relief. Therefore it is difficult to determine the exact appearance of the Apollo from any evidence other than the coins and the extant fragments of the figure. In terms of date only the form of the sandals and the deep carving of the drapery folds betray Hellenistic workmanship. With the two female figures the remains are more substantial and their styles more evident.

³¹ For an illustration see Lambrinudakis, 1984, no.960.

The Artemis

The figure of Artemis survives only as a massive headless and limbless torso with the lower break at just above knee level. For any restoration we must look to the coin from Kolophon, which shows that Artemis stood to the right of her seated brother whom she turns towards. She raises her right arm and holds a long torch whilst her left hangs down and may have held some object which is unclear on the coins. The fragment shows that the goddess wore a peplos but it is clear from the coins that she was draped down to her feet. This is not the usual attire of the Hellenistic Artemis, who often wore a short tunic, and therefore parallels are hard to come by. Her right, standing leg shows indications of the folds of material on her right side. Also if the chiton ended at the point shown on the coin, it would have been extremely short and revealed most of her thighs. We should perhaps see this junction in the material as the overfold of the garment and not its lower extremity. Of course, the miniature representation of the figure on the coins can never be clearly understood, and fine details remain obscure. What is important is the style and technique of the torso.

In terms of size, execution and its massive build, the Klaros Artemis resembles Damophon's Artemis from Lykosoura. Yet this is where the similarity ends. Damophon created a far more complex image, with finely conceived, though not technically brilliant, pleats and overfolds in the drapery, forming tiers of folds in the garment. The Klaros figure is simpler in design yet equally Hellenistic in character though not all agree. Flashar classifies this Artemis type as fourth century in date and in this respect there is at least one late Classical parallel in terms of the drapery. This is the so-called bronze

Artemis from the Piraeus.³² Both figures wear a long peplos with a large overfold of material. The dress is pulled taut over the large breasts which are divided by the strap of the quiver, but the pleats of material are dragged down beneath the high girdle to emerge on the other side in short, tightly packed wrinkles, which then hang in longer folds around the hips. Yet the Klaros figure is much heavier in build and the treatment of the drapery more dynamic. Kahil categorises the Klarian figure with a group of Artemis statues, best illustrated by the Getty statue.³³ This figure, however, bears only a passing resemblance to the colossal cult figure from Klaros and this highlights the problem in attempting to find close parallels for the Klaros figure.

A possible and closer parallel is to be found in a small statue in Rhodes Archaeological Museum.³⁴ Again the arrangement of the peplos is similar above the girdle and this and her quiver strap are in the same position. Beneath this the material folds in a naturalistic manner and there is a certain plastic quality about it, lacking in the colossal Klarian figure. The main difference is the additional garment worn by the Rhodian Artemis which hangs in heavy folds around her sides. The effect, however, is similar and the Rhodian statue compares well with the Artemis on the coin, particularly in the sense of movement in both figures, with their left legs trailing behind in a vigorous movement. The Rhodian figure may be slightly later than the Klarian Artemis and is not a copy of the cult image but is carved in a similar vein and of a corresponding type.

³² For an illustration of this figure see Stewart, 1990, figs.569-70.

³³ Kahil, 1984,709.

³⁴ For an illustration see Merker, 1973, figs.16-18.

In conclusion, the Artemis cannot be easily paralleled, but is certainly Hellenistic in date and shows signs of the dynamism to be found in other sculptures from western Asia Minor. This vibrant modelling has not reached the level of intensity of the Gigantomachy at Pergamon, but it can be compared to the figure of "Adrasteia" from the south frieze. Considering the colossal scale of the Klarian Artemis and this goddess on the frieze, there is a certain sensuality and understanding of the female form. The breasts are accentuated by the high girdle which draws the material tightly over their contours and the short, deeply carved creases of the garment between, contrast effectively with these large, rounded planes. The Artemis is a powerfully formed, massive figure, showing stylistic affinities with both sculptures from Pergamon and from Rhodes and Delos. An exact date is difficult to determine, but she certainly comes from the high Hellenistic period, perhaps slightly earlier than the Gigantomachy at Pergamon, if the temple dates to the later third century.

The Leto

Of a similar sensuous style, but more beautifully conceived than the Artemis, is the Leto who, even in her fragmentary state, is a powerful and intricately designed statue. Of all the three figures, the Leto is perhaps the most effective piece for resolving the problematic date of the group. On the coins from Kolophon, Leto is only sketchily depicted with few details except for the sweeping folds of an himation over her right, weight bearing leg. Unfortunately the fragment consisting of the goddess breaks off at this point, but it is probable that this marked the juncture between the torso and the legs.

The drapery arrangement of the Leto cannot be exactly paralleled in other sculptures but individual pieces do have certain features in common. Firstly it is possible to recognise three garments worn by the goddess, a chiton visible at the neckline, a peplos over the left breast and finally a himation covering the remainder of the torso. The deep and diagonal folds of this latter garment, cross over her right shoulder and under her left breast. Such a variety of garments and textures of different materials resembles the bronze fragment of a female figure found off the coast of Knidos and now in Izmir.³⁵ The composition is slightly different to the Leto in that more is revealed of the peplos over the right breast, but the diagonal folds and the bunching up of the two lower garments at the neckline are comparable. On both figures the garments have luxurious folds and pleats and the so-called "press folds", and the execution of the textures of the different garments is superb. The crumpled material of Leto's chiton contrasts effectively with the stretched material of the himation over the right breast. The Leto is massively formed with a full figure and the volume is augmented by the deep channels which have been chiselled out of the marble at the junctions of the garments and where the material of one garment is tucked under another. In this respect the Klarian statue compares well with female figures from Pergamon. Two of the goddesses on the Gigantomachy from the Great Altar display the dynamic modelling of the drapery over massive forms which is such a prominent feature of the Leto. The Nyx/Kore on the north side is the closest parallel, with the himation coiled around and beneath the right breast and also the press-folds over the tauter fabric of her chiton. Flashar compares the Leto with the Amphitrite on the frieze, a figure carved in a similar manner to the Nyx/Kore.³⁶ Here the drapery is equally deeply folded, but

³⁵ Ridgway, 1967,3-9.

³⁶ Flashar, 1992,152.

the best comparison lies in the treatment of the material covering the stomach area. On the Leto the material is pulled tightly around her abdomen and the resulting sweeping arcs of material have the effect of making this part of her body even more swollen.

Furthermore, the thick, linear folds of the peplos underneath are subtly defined but appear naturalistic, a feature which is surprising on a statue of such colossal proportions. In this respect its most striking parallel is a headless female figure of Roman date found at Aphrodisias, which copies a high Hellenistic original.³⁷ On this figure the thin cloak folds in sweeping, shallow curves over the abdomen revealing heavier, linear ridges and furrows of the material of the thicker garment beneath. That such a style was not restricted to the cities of Asia Minor is demonstrated by a fragment of a female, upper torso from Kos who wears three garments of varying degrees of thickness with deeply carved folds arranged in strong diagonal configurations.³⁸

Flashar does not believe that the Leto is at such a developed stage of the dynamic style as the Gigantomachy goddesses, but it must be remembered that the quiet pose of the Klaros figure differs from their violently motivated poses. Other sculptures from the city, however, are motionless yet still retain a vigorous modelling of the drapery. One particular female figure is extremely close to the Leto, but the drapery is not carved in such an intricate manner.³⁹ All the aforementioned sculptures have yet another distinct design element, their inflated forms, which add vitality to the various poses and cause the material of the drapery to cling in certain places and to cluster in deep folds in others.

³⁷ For an illustration see Erim, 1986, 100.

³⁸ For an illustration of this fragment see Kabus-Preisshofen, 1989,258-9,no.62,plate 38.1. The author dates this piece to the mid third century which is perhaps too early due to its advanced dynamic qualities.

³⁹ Winter, 1908,1,no.54.

The effect on all examples is striking, but the dates of such pieces possibly vary between the last quarter of the third century into the second century, perhaps even to the final stages of the Pergamon altar's construction. Therefore it is perhaps impossible to isolate a secure date for the Leto which, of all three cult figures, should potentially betray a date more than the others.

From the rather gentler carving of the Apollo and Artemis, however, we should perhaps accept a late third century date for the execution of the cult group at Klaros, which would tie in with the historical and architectural evidence for the dedication of a temple. The figures are certainly not of Hadrianic date, their style and method of carving is Hellenistic without a doubt. The late third century would tie in well with the architectural development of the sanctuary and the revival of the oracle, but a brief analysis of the historical situation should help to substantiate the date of the group and their context.

The earliest possible date for the temple's construction is about 300 B.C., as ceramic finds in the foundations confirm. Such an early date would be inappropriate however as the citizens of Kolophon had been temporarily re-settled in Ephesos by Lysimachos and did not return to their homeland until his death in 281 B.C. Shortly afterwards the city was strengthened by new fortifications, but any rebuilding of the city's shrines would not have been as urgent and the temple may have been constructed when economic conditions were revived. Yet the city and its counterpart Notion, were never of major importance in this period and only survived because of the oracle at Klaros. We may then have to turn elsewhere for the possible incentive for and financing of the new temple.

The region fell under Attalid rule briefly around 219 B.C. and, as already noted, the style of the two female figures finds parallels at Pergamon. But this Attalid domination was short lived and then the area came under Seleukid influence, and one illuminating find at the site was an inscribed statue base mentioning the names Antiochos III and Antiochos IV.⁴⁰ It is not known if these monarchs patronised the cult financially, but such an action would not be surprising in a dynasty who had previously financed the early stages of the new temples of Apollo at Didyma and of Artemis at Sardis. The architectural features of the temple are still under scrutiny and the later restorations confuse matters, but the style of the cult images would suit a date later in the third century. Further investigations at Klaros will hopefully illuminate the rather cloudy historical circumstances surrounding the revival of the oracle, its new temple and cult images. All that be concluded is that the fragments of the cult images betray a fine master sculptor's hand and would have been an impressive sight within the temple. The Apollo was of the semi-draped Kitharoidos type, which was to remain popular well into the following century.

The Second Century B.C.

This century has yielded evidence for many of the cult images of Apollo and Artemis and, like the previous century, many of their sanctuaries were developed and new ones built. One of the most important temples of Apollo in Asia Minor was rebuilt about 200 B.C. at Chryse in the Troad, which was dedicated to Apollo Smintheos, the *Mouse God*, and the famous cult image by Skopas was re-housed in this grand temple.⁴¹ Another important

⁴⁰ See Flashar, 1992,151.

⁴¹ See Özgünel, 1990,35-44 for a discussion of the sanctuary.

sanctuary developed during this century was the Letoon in Xanthos in Lycia.⁴² The largest of the group of temples was of the Ionic order, and was probably dedicated to the mother of the divine twins. The other two are slightly later in date, towards the middle of the century, and were probably dedicated to Apollo and Artemis. Unfortunately no trace of the respective cult images from this sanctuary survives and so little can be said here apart from the continuing importance of the deities in Asia Minor. Later in the century, a large, pseudo-dipteral temple was erected for Apollo at Alabanda in Karia, but nothing is known about the cult image. Yet at least one important fragment from a possible cult statue survives from this region, the Apollo from Tralleis, to be discussed below.

On the Greek mainland, several sanctuaries and temples received new cult statues and were architecturally embellished during this period, namely at Messene and at Argos. The importance of these images is that the names of the sculptors are known to us, an unusual scenario for the Hellenistic period as a whole. Another important fragment comes from Gortyn in western Crete. To begin with, however, important fragments from the Asklepieion at Messene, where Damophon created several cult images of the deities, require examination.

The cult images of Apollo and Artemis at Messene by Damophon

The numerous contracts awarded to the sculptor Damophon, a native of Messene, have already been analysed in the sections concerning his group of cult images in the temple of Asklepios and his late third to early second century date determined in the discussion of

⁴² See Le Roy, 1991,346-351 for a discussion of the temples.

the Lykosoura group. These commissions were by no means the only cult statues assigned to the sculptor within the city of Messene, as Pausanias also informs us that he made the statues of the Mother of the gods, a Tyche, a personification of the city of Thebes, a Herakles, of which fragments have recently been identified, but more importantly here, a group of Apollo and the Muses and two cult statues of Artemis.⁴³ These two latter images were certainly placed in the temples of Artemis Phosphoros and Artemis Orthia and had a ritual function, so are relevant here. The problem lies in the fact that in recent years many substantial fragments of different types of Artemis figures have been recovered from various parts of Messene. Therefore it is difficult to distinguish possible cult statue fragments from votive or other images. Furthermore the figures of Apollo and the Muses may not have acted as temple statues and therefore it is important to assess the possible purpose of this group, any sculptural remains and its location within the city. These questions are perhaps more important to answer than the stylistic analysis of the head of Apollo. The career and date of Damophon has already been discussed and his style defined, but what may be interesting is to discover whether his work at Messene preceded or post dated that at Lykosoura.

Apollo and the Muses (catalogue number 16), figs. 55-56.

To place the group of Apollo and the Muses in context is perhaps the most difficult consideration, but integral to such a study. Four fragments of over life-size marble sculptures were found in a room situated in the northern stoa of the Asklepeion complex,

⁴³ Pausanias, 4.31.6-10.

labelled **H** by the excavators.⁴⁴ Apart from the head of Apollo were found a fragment of a plinth with a colossal, male foot which Themelis believes is too large for the Apollo, but could be a fragment of another of Damophon's male figures.⁴⁵ Also found were fragments of female figures. These marble remains come from several large sculptures, but not necessarily those which were placed in this room. Themelis is correct when he claims that the group of Apollo and the Muses could have not been accommodated in such a small room or on the base found in room **H**.⁴⁶ What seems to be the case is that this location is merely the last resting place of the sculptures after their thorough destruction in later antiquity. The only room in the Asklepieion where ten large statues could have been placed is room **Ξ** that preserves the remains of a semi-circular base. This is located in the west stoa near the shrine of Artemis, the possible position of the Tyche and the Herakles and, as Pausanias mentions these in one sentence, he presumably saw them in close proximity to each other. If Themelis is correct, and there is no reason to disbelieve his theory as yet, then many of the rooms on the western side of the complex were shrines and therefore probably contained cult images. The sanctuary of Artemis perhaps contained the Artemis Phosphoros by Damophon, of which a hand possibly survives as well as the cult statue base. Next to this room **M** may have contained Damophon's cult statue of Tyche, room **N2** the Herakles and the room with the semi-circular base, Apollo and the Muses. Whether this room contained cult images is difficult to define as no trace of an altar was found in front of the base. Yet Damophon seems only to have created groups of deities and personifications and there is no evidence as to whether he created votive or

⁴⁴ For the most up to date plan of the complex see Themelis, 1993 (2), fig.2. Two colossal arms were also recovered but are of Roman date.

⁴⁵ Themelis, 1993(2), 27.

⁴⁶ Themelis, 1993(2),31, has recently proposed that this is where the cult images of Asklepios and his sons stood and not in the temple in the centre of the complex.

portrait statues. Therefore it is an attractive theory that all his known works were cult images and that was his main activity as a sculptor. Furthermore, the entire complex was a sanctuary, of Asklepios primarily and possibly of the city goddess Messene and so room E could justifiably be designated a shrine of Apollo Musagetes. To take this one step further, if the Apollo was represented as leader of the Muses, he may have been of the Kitharoidos type, so popular in the Hellenistic period. To ascertain such a proposal the extant fragments of the image need to be investigated.

Unfortunately of the many sculpture fragments found in the Asklepieion, the only piece so far attributed to the Apollo is the head, though other segments may be found in future excavations which join. The head was immediately recognised as the work of Damophon and labelled Apollo rather than one of the other male images by Damophon, such as the Herakles or one of the sons of Asklepios. Perhaps, however, this identification should not be taken for granted. The recently found head in Damophon's style, labelled Herakles by Themelis, has no obvious parallels amongst Hellenistic images of the hero and its longer, curly hair, contrasts with the short locks of the "Apollo".⁴⁷ Other fragments of the "Herakles" statue were recovered, but none exhibit signs that would identify the figure as either god or hero. Furthermore, if this is the head of the hero then it is surprising that the sculptor selected the unbearded, Classical type of model, rather than the usual full bearded, older Herakles type more common in the Hellenistic period. In fact, either head could belong to either statue, but both demonstrate the style of the sculptor implicitly. The only clue as to the head usually identified as Apollo certainly being the god is the

⁴⁷ For the Herakles see Themelis, 1993(2), plate 5.

large, coarse lump of marble on the back of the head, where Despinis suggested metal locks of hair were added which may have fallen over the shoulders.

The same problem arises when attempting to identify the various female deities amongst the fragments also exhibiting the style of the Messenian sculptor. The most substantial of these is a fragment of a female head preserving the left eye, forehead and part of the hair.⁴⁸ Themelis claims that this belongs to one of Damophon's female cult images, but the Messene fragment bears little resemblance to the Lykosoura Demeter and only has faint allusions with the Artemis. The hair of the Messene fragment is rather crinkly in its appearance and follows late Classical conventions of design. The eye is rather long, almond shaped and Praxitelean in form, not like the short, flat lower lidded and arched upper lidded eyes at Lykosoura. It is in fact much more Classical in style and probably not the work of Damophon or his sons. With the so-called Apollo, however, the overwhelming comparisons with the Lykosoura heads renders its attribution to Damophon absolute. Therefore a brief analysis of the style of the Apollo seems warranted.

It has already been hinted that the work at Lykosoura pre-dated that at Messene and the architectural remains at that city would substantiate this theory. What is important then is to try to detect any developments in the later style of Damophon in the Apollo. The analysis of the Lykosoura cult group revealed conclusively that the sculptor relied heavily on non-marble appendages and decoration to enhance the rather summary treatment of certain anatomical and drapery features. Paint, inlays, ornamental carving and metal attachments were utilised to complete the statues. We can only hope that this was the

⁴⁸ Themelis, 1993 (2), plate 4, no.6.

same with his group of Apollo and the Muses, a large group that must have required more than just the master sculptor himself and therefore his sons may have been involved in much of the work. The head of Apollo, even in its battered state, appears rather coarse in execution. The hair is only roughly blocked out, particularly on the crown and at the back and lacks any depth of carving. The so-called Herakles, however, exhibits an attempt to isolate individual locks by deep carving of the stone and the hair on this head is more regular in its arrangement but still rather coarsely modelled. The Apollo, however, wears an elaborate headband above which is a row of dowel holes, perhaps for the attaching of a metal laurel crown. These attachments and the additional inlaid eyes would have greatly enhanced the visual impact of the head which, even in its battered state, shows a lively, if somewhat cursory treatment, of the hair, flesh surfaces and facial features. Like the Artemis from Lykosoura, the Apollo is massive in build, but the naso-labial area is sensitively carved with slight indentations around the corners of the lips and swollen cheeks.

Another of Damophon's stylistic traits is the breadth of the jawline resulting in broad cheeks. The Apollo also shares, with both Demeter and Artemis, the wide, shallow forehead, but of course in this case it is more masculine in its structure. Yet the effect, like the Lykosoura sculptures, is not classicising in the least. In fact, the style is not unlike Baroque works of the period, but is a diluted version compared to the contemporary Asklepios from Mounychia or Damophon's Anytos. Yet here the impression is certainly more dynamic and animated than the Gortyn Apollo, which although it shares several comparative features with the Messene head, is a blander and, technically, less competent work, though of the same artistic stream. The Messene "Apollo" is one of the successful

pieces in this quietly dynamic style. One of the other notable works of a similar strain is the Pergamene Parthenos, who also has a short mouth, sensitively rendered lips, fleshy, yet prominent cheekbones which combine to generate a gentle smile.⁴⁹ Now that Damophon has been justifiably up-dated, we can perhaps also raise the dates of comparable pieces, even those found in a geographically distant location from mainland Greece, like the Parthenos. Rather than seeing these works as a conservative reaction to the excesses of the high Hellenistic Baroque style, exemplified by the Gigantomachy at Pergamon, we should perhaps see them as an indication of the potential dynamism emerging from the later third century schools of sculpture, with Damophon being a prolific master of the genre and using these characteristics to create calmly composed but vibrantly modelled, spirited cult images.

Damophon's Apollo is an authentic portrayal of the god and is perhaps more reliable than later copies, assumed to have early second century prototypes, to reconstruct the iconography of the god. One thinks of the Giustiniani and Pourtalès heads of Apollo, both of which are in the British Museum, that combine highly Baroque facial expressions and hairstyles, the former of which is reminiscent of the Capitoline Aphrodite type.⁵⁰ Yet these theatrical works are difficult to place within the chronology of Hellenistic sculpture and, being copies, albeit of fine quality, cannot be as informative as original Hellenistic works like the Messene head. Furthermore the two copies seem to develop the type best known in the Apollo Belvedere, in the guise of the archer, whereas cult images of this period tend to depict Apollo in his musical role, as leader of the Muses.

⁴⁹ See section on Athena for a reference.

⁵⁰ British Museum, Smith, III, 1904, sculptures 1547 and 1548.

This leads us to the question of how Apollo was represented at Messene and a possible restoration. It is interesting that Flashar does not include Damophon's head with other Hellenistic Kitharoidos types, apart from a brief mention where he compares it with the Apollo Civitavecchia and the Tralleis Apollo.⁵¹ The author, however, regards these works, and others of the late Hellenistic period, as having a lifeless facial structure, particularly around the mouths. This is certainly, as already mentioned, not the case in the Messene and Tralleis heads which, in any case, are earlier in date than Flashar proposes. It has now become clear that the foot found with the head does not belong to the Apollo due to the discrepancy in scale and so we are at a loss to restore the entire figure. The youthful, long haired Apolline structure and design is not fashioned in the same vein as the effeminate, Dionysian types, such as the Tralleis or Cyrene Apollos. In fact Damophon's image retains a masculinity not seen in many other Hellenistic portrayals of the god. This is not to say that the sculptor looked back to Classical, athletic types for inspiration, as it cannot be paralleled amongst Classical sculptures. Damophon merely created an image of the god as leader of the Muses, perhaps to be restored in heroic nudity or semi-draped, or fully clothed. The remains of the dowel in the neck suggests that it was placed on another separately made portion, perhaps comprising the lower neck, shoulders and torso. If the head had been placed in a draped body, then we might expect the head to have been carved in one piece with the neck, forming a tenon to be inserted into the shoulders, and the join concealed, though this is speculative. The final comments really must concern a possible date for the piece.

⁵¹ Flashar, 1992, 189.

Since the recent re-dating of Damophon by Themelis, there is potential for a discussion about the development of Damophon's style. Since the sculptor created so many cult images for various cities in the Peloponnese, often on a colossal scale and consisting of several figures, we must envisage a long career. Themelis suggested that his career spans the years 223 - 190 B.C. and that he was assisted by his two sons. Themelis continues to claim that Damophon's extensive works at Messene were probably conducted before 191 B.C., a date when the Romans reduced the influence of the Achaean League over the area. The earliest date for Damophon's activity in the city was possibly 215 - 214 B.C. when there was a power change after a period of political and economic instability when the city was ruled by oligarchs. As the influence of the Achaean League grew, the government took on a more democratic guise. Yet the city flourished during all these systems of government and architectural projects were undertaken and the Asklepieion was developed. Architectural elements would suggest a date in the first quarter of the second century for much of the building work and therefore Damophon's activity probably coincided with the building of the shrines. So Damophon's work at Messene probably post-dated that at Lykosoura, but do the sculptural fragments betray the sculptor at his peak.

Opinions tend to favour the Apollo over the Lykosoura group in both quality and technique. Smith refers to the head as a counterpart of Artemis and suggests that it is of finer quality, but fails to explain his reasoning.⁵² When the heads are compared they in fact show an equal execution of the facial features; they have a plastic appearance which is often likened to wood carving, with the impressionistic treatment of the hair and a solid structure, yet pliable skin tones. Neither head is in fact of outstanding technical ability

⁵² Smith, 1991, 241.

and Damophon certainly took short cuts in the modelling of the hair and facial features, and only finished those areas precisely that could be seen when the figure was standing in its original position. The backs of the heads are rather summarily treated, the Artemis being more of a mask than a head carved in the round. To conclude, the head of Apollo shows no great development in style when compared with the Lykosoura group, but then again so little is preserved of the Messene figure. There are other fragments of sculpture from Messene that could belong to some of Damophon's cult statues but so few can be attributed to him with certainty, but some pieces may belong to one of two his cult statues of Artemis.

Artemis at Messene

Recent excavations at Messene have shown that there were many different shrines dedicated to Artemis dating from the second century B.C. Furthermore, substantial fragments of many statues of the goddess have also been recovered from various locations, the finest being a complete marble statue of Artemis in her huntress guise which is a Roman copy of an early Hellenistic original.⁵⁴ The most famous cult image of the goddess, however, was carved by Damophon and was placed in the temple of Artemis Laphria which was possibly located on Mount Ithome.⁵⁵ As one of the most prominent cult images in the city we may expect it to be reproduced on coins, and one coin from the city shows a figure of Artemis standing with her right hand raised and holding a spear and her left hand down.⁵⁶ The coin is not clear in its details, but the goddess appears to be

⁵⁴ See Ergon, 1989, 31, fig.30 for an illustration.

⁵⁵ See Pausanias, 4,31,7.

⁵⁶ See Imhoof-Blumer, 1964, plate P,3.

dressed in her hunting attire, that is a short tunic and possibly high boots. The cult of Artemis Laphria was most popular in Kalydon in Aetolia and also in Patras where the cult images possibly refer back to the original of the type, a chryselephantine statue carved by the sculptors Menachmos and Soidas in the early fifth century. The usual Laphria type shows the goddess in an animated pose with her right hand on her hip and holding a bow and arrow and often with her hunting dog beside her. The coin from Messene shows a slightly less lively figure and there are no obvious signs of her dog. If the coin does depict Damophon's statue, then the sculptor departed from the usual type for the Laphria and created a quieter, standing image. Of course the coin may show one of the many other cult statues of the goddess from the city, and may be of little help in determining the original appearance of the statue. One figure that the coin probably does not depict is the Artemis Phosphoros, the *Light Bringer* which Pausanias describes amongst the other images within the Asklepieion. Her title suggests a figure holding torches rather than an Artemis in hunting apparel. There are fragments of colossal marble statues which may belong to this image, the most likely attribution being part of a right hand holding what may be a torch.⁵⁷ Themelis suggests that this may be part of Damophon's cult image, but in its battered state it is difficult to determine the style of the carving and therefore hard to compare with other works by the sculptor.

Two recently found marble fragments come from a large statue of Artemis which do betray signs of Damophon's style. They were found in a temple known to be that of Artemis Orthia, situated to the north east of the Asklepieion, and probably dating to the

⁵⁷ See Themelis, 1993 (2), 106.

first half of the second century B.C.⁵⁸ Terracotta figurines forming a votive deposit from the temple show both Artemis as a huntress and Artemis Phosphoros. The marble fragments show that the cult image was of the hunting type with the remains of the quiver strap running under her left breast and a layered tunic, rather like that of Artemis from Lykosoura. The execution of the fragment consisting of the right breast, girdle and drapery is similar in style to figures from Pergamon in that the forms are full, rounded and the material deeply carved creating contrasts with the areas where the material of the garment is pulled taut. The right hand side preserves part of an animal skin tucked up under her girdle, a device not paralleled easily amongst extant works. The general execution of the fragments, however, can probably be dated to the first half of the second century B.C., but any attributions to Damophon should await further investigation of the small shrines and the possibility that more pieces of the figure may emerge.

In conclusion, the cult images of Artemis at Messene were numerous in the second century B.C. and portrayed the goddess in several guises. More research at the site and with the sculptural fragments is required before we can fully understand the nature of her cult images in the city. Damophon certainly carved the most famous figure, the Artemis Laphria and one other, but other shrines have yielded evidence also. For the group of Apollo and the Muses, which possibly served a cult in the sanctuary, little evidence survives, other than the head of the god. This piece is perhaps one of the most interesting and surprising Hellenistic fragments of Apollo, showing a more masculine and athletic type which was outnumbered by the more popular languid and effeminate types in the

⁵⁸ The fragments have not yet been published. For illustrations see Ergon, 1990, 32, figs.41-2.

second century B.C. A head of a similar style but perhaps owing more to the Daphne Apollo is from Gortyn on Crete.

The Apollo Pytheios at Gortyn, Crete (catalogue number 17), fig. 57.

The cult of Apollo Pytheios has a long history in the city of Gortyn in Crete. The large temple was built in the Archaic period, but a major rebuilding occurred in the Hellenistic period, perhaps around 183 B.C. when a contract was made with the Attalid king Eumenes II *. This alliance was made with Pergamon after years of instability in the city and the domination by Ptolemaic kings over this unfortified and thus vulnerable city. This political stability, and the connection with the cities of western Asia Minor through the Attalid king, perhaps brought new religious ideas. Indeed we must not forget that this region contained some of the most eminent sanctuaries of Apollo, at Didyma, Miletos and Klaros, where the temples had been recently enlarged and their reputations' enhanced. This period then would be the most appropriate time for the city of Gortyn to develop its most significant city cult. The Archaic temple was not replaced but augmented by a Doric colonnade of six columns at the front and pilasters which were placed between the rooms inside. Architectural elements from the temple's enlargement would support such a date on stylistic grounds, but the temple was also embellished in the second century AD. The architectural history of the shrine is under study at present by Italian archaeologists and therefore we must await their results before too many firm conclusions are drawn from the existing scanty evidence. The interest here lies, of course, in the cult image which, if it was erected during the period of Attalid influence, may have been influenced by the dynamic style prevalent at Pergamon and, as Flashar points out, may have been the work

of one of the state sculptors there.⁵⁹ Thus a detailed analysis of the style and appearance of this virtually ignored head, is of interest here.

When seen in its position in Herakleion museum, the Gortyn head has been placed on a torso wearing a long chiton draped in the typical kitharoidos arrangement. The arrangement of the garment can be compared to figures such as the Dionysos from Delphi and the Apollo Patroos by Euphranor. But this torso is generally believed to be a Roman replacement, so we must not ignore the torso as it is part of the figure's history, but it is the Hellenistic head which is of importance and furthermore when the body was replaced the construction technique of the statue underwent a drastic alteration. Flashar justly believes that the second century cult image was in fact an acrolith rather than being made entirely out of marble.⁶⁰ Certain elements of its construction and form suggest that it was intended to be viewed not from the sides or back, and that its almost relief like shallow depth and unusually shaped tenon forming the neck, suggest that it was deliberately reduced in weight to be placed in a wooden framework. The rectangular hole in the top of the head has been considered by Flashar as a socket for an attachment to a wall behind. This would only be necessary if the head required additional support and for the weight of a heavy marble head on a wooden statue to be reduced by such a method of attachment. Therefore it appears likely that the statue was dramatically altered at some point in its history. The body was perhaps destroyed or damaged, but the head survived and was thus placed on a marble torso which is inferior in technique to the head.

⁵⁹ Flashar, 1992,95.

⁶⁰ Flashar, 1992, 96.

Stylistically the head compares well with many other sculptures dated to the first half of the second century B.C., particularly with the head of Apollo from Messene. The analysis of the Lykosoura group, however, has already shown the relationship between Damophon and Pergamon, although his work in Arkadia pre-dates the Great Altar frieze. This suggests that the magnificent monument at Pergamon was constructed when this dynamic style was nearing its end and reached its most energetic phase in the frieze. That Damophon and sculptors who created works like the Gortyn head have so much in common with Pergamene sculptors reveals their importance in the development of this particular stream of Hellenistic sculpture. The Apollo is not really a work of a first rate sculptor and not as proficient even as Damophon, yet as we look at the head today we forget how the whole effect was augmented by additions in paint, inlay and possibly also metal additions. The hair in particular must have been enhanced with some other material, though no dowel holes exist for the addition of extra locks of hair. The surface of the sides and back of the head have been worked and show tool markings, which indicates that this was an area roughed out to receive some other material: perhaps the hair was plated in gold or the ridge around the head may have supported a metal wreath. Thus the sculptor was aware of the difficulty in observing specific features in the darkness of a temple and created a powerful image with large, inlaid eyes, broad planes of flesh and little additional surface detail. Damophon was another sculptor who worked in the same medium and in a similar vein, though his attention to detail on the drapery of Despoina contradicts his general style.

On close examination the Gortyn head resembles the Messene Apollo, though is more Hellenistic in character due to the long hair and presumably draped Kitharoidos body.

Particularly close is the treatment of the nose and mouth and the swollen surfaces around their contours. The small mouth is another common trait in sculpture of this period and at Pergamon the Parthenos shares these characteristics also, as mentioned above. Her profile has the same right angled junction of the chin and the neck as both Damophon's Apollo and the Gortyn head. There are subtle differences also such as the more rounded contour of the lower eyelid of the Gortyn head compared to the flatter line forming the eyes of Damophon's works. The marble surfaces, however, all compare well in their rather plastic appearance with no sharp transitions or outlines. There seems no doubt that the Gortyn head has affinities with works that were previously and erroneously classified as neo-classical in style, and it also has affinities amongst Pergamene sculptures. The style of the piece is, however, much less dynamic and more appropriate for a cult image. Crete was not a great centre of sculpture during the Hellenistic period but the Kore from Knossos also resembles Pergamene figures, but was a quieter version. Other acroliths of this period tend to be fragmentary and the Apollo is certainly earlier than the Hygieia head from Pheneos with her stark, severe features and sharp contours and abrupt transitions. Nor does it compare well with the Aegira Dionysos. An obvious choice for the inspiration of the acrolith from Gortyn would, of course, be the Apollo by Bryaxis at Daphne, already over a century old by the time the statue on Crete was constructed. A period in the first quarter of the second century B.C. would fit the style of the piece, even with its conservative features, and its relationship with Pergamon and the Attalids is testified in its closeness with the Parthenos from that city.

Another Apollo from Tralleis bears a greater resemblance to sculptures from Pergamon and was perhaps the most influential type in the later Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The Tralleis and Cyrene type (catalogue numbers 30 and 38), figs. 92-93 and 109.

An important and often studied Hellenistic type of Apollo is the statue preserved in many Roman reproductions with the best example being that found in a temple at Cyrene. A lesser known, but extremely important Hellenistic original is the Tralleis Apollo now in Istanbul museum.⁶¹ This fragment consisting of the head and upper body had been reused in a modern house near the theatre at Tralleis but may have originally functioned as a cult image. It is possible that a temple to Apollo was situated close by the theatre but is, as yet, undiscovered.⁶² The main problem is whether the Tralleis figure was the prototype from which all the Roman variations derive their inspiration, or if this Hellenistic Apollo was a contemporary or later version of a famous original which stood elsewhere. Therefore it is important to assess the style of the Tralleis figure and determine its date. The Cyrene type did function as a cult image, but both statue and the temple in which it stood are dated to the second century A.D.⁶³ The Tralleis figure may well have served the same function and it is this statue which is of fundamental interest in this study but the two cannot be analysed without reference to the other. Another important consideration is that this type of Apollo shows the same characteristics as certain figures of Dionysos. The iconography of the two gods had been assimilated as we have already established in the section concerning Dionysos. The figures still retain the

⁶¹ This statue has only recently been the subject of more attention and Smith illustrates and discusses the figure in two of his publications, 1991, 65 and 1993, 189, fig.185.

⁶² The statue could also be identified as Dionysos, a god whose cult is equally likely to be located near the theatre. Coins from the city show a standing, semi draped statue of the god resting his arm on a satyr and may reproduce a cult image located at Tralleis, see Pochmarski, 1990, plate 81,1.

⁶³ The temple of Apollo at Cyrene went through many architectural phases but the statue belongs to the later Roman reconstruction of the building. Whether the statue reproduces an original Hellenistic cult image which stood in an earlier temple at the site is uncertain but its flamboyant and Baroque style are at odds with the severe Doric form of the Roman temple.

basic form of the Kitharoidos type of Apollo but are different to the Daphne or Klaros cult images which retained their Apolline masculinity and a more dignified arrangement of drapery. Given these important considerations and the renewed interest in the type shown by Flashar's study of the type the two images require an in depth analysis.

The colossal head and torso of this Apollo is our only original, large scale, Hellenistic figure of the semi-draped, standing Kitharoidos type to have so far been recovered. It therefore merits detailed examination and should be raised above the ranks of later copies of the type which are found in many European museums. The head is finely preserved and therefore it should, in theory, be possible to discover parallels which may help us to determine the date of the piece. The statue has been variously dated but never studied in depth, though few scholars would regard this particular figure as the model for the scores of later variations. Smith regards the statue as a Hellenistic version of the original from which the Cyrene statue was copied.⁶⁴ Thus the Tralleis Apollo requires thorough examination in terms of style before any safe conclusions can be reached.

When the head alone was published, before the discovery of the torso, the figure was considered to be a later version of a fourth century Praxitelean type of Apollo or Dionysos.⁶⁵ Its identification as a Dionysos rested on Collignon's suggestion that the head was originally completed with a metal band, or mitra, worn over the crown. Three holes can be seen in the unworked parts of the head and obviously some object was attached here. This, however, does not prove that the subject portrayed was not Apollo,

⁶⁴ Smith, 1991, 65.

⁶⁵ Collignon, 1888, 289-295.

who could also have a headband or even more likely a laurel wreath in his hair.

Furthermore, the statue's great similarity with the Cyrene statue does seem to indicate that Apollo is portrayed but the problem highlights the interesting blend of the iconography of the two gods in Hellenistic images. With the recovery of the naked torso, associations with the style of Praxiteles have become even stronger due to its languid appearance and the soft treatment of the fleshy surfaces. The softness of the facial features do indeed bear a passing resemblance to works by the sculptor, but the form of the head, with its broad cheeks, short mouth and wide forehead are not easily to parallel amongst works by that master. In fact, the expression is even more sensitive than works such as the Hermes at Olympia and the Aphrodite from Knidos. The fleshy upper eyelids conceal rather large eyes which have a rounded form which is unlike the long, narrow Praxitelean rendition of the eye.

Smith dates the Apollo to the third century, but does not support such a proposal with comparative works. Some scholars have dated the statue to about 200 B.C., for instance Mendel and Laubscher, but they did not provide sufficient parallels to confirm this early date.⁶⁵ More recently scholars have preferred a late date for the piece, Flashar proposing around 120 B.C.⁶⁶ Such a date is appropriate, particularly when other sculptures found at Tralleis are considered. The so-called Kaufmann head of Aphrodite, the Melian Aphrodite, carved by a sculptor who came from near Tralleis, and several other works from the city display classicising tendencies which would date them lower in the second century and early in the first century B.C. The closest in style to the Tralleis Apollo is

⁶⁵ Mendel, 1914, 269-70, no.548, dates it to around 200 B.C.; Laubscher, 1966, 125, between the third and second centuries B.C.

⁶⁶ Flashar, 1992, 136-7. Akurgal, 1987, 116, also suggests a late date for the statue.

the Melian Aphrodite. This resemblance is more obvious in profile where the linking characteristic is the smooth transition from brow to the line of the nose. But even from this angle the Aphrodite shows far more Classical mannerisms such as the flatter line of the upper eyelid, the longer, thinner lips and a more deeply set eye. The Melos statue is certainly an eclectic product of a late Hellenistic classicising school, whereas the Apollo is an earlier piece without the bland facial features of other sculptures from that city which tend to be versions of late Classical Attic pieces. In fact, the formation of the eyes and other facial features are not Attic in style, but are paralleled more convincingly with other sculptures from western Asia Minor.

Flashar compares the head with the Aphrodite from the Mahdia shipwreck.⁶⁸ He bases this relationship on the blurry treatment of the skin and the merging of the facial features. In fact, the Mahdia head has much more clearly defined features than the Apollo and is classicising in style, having more in common with Praxiteles, or is at least early Hellenistic in character. One of Flashar's more successful parallels is with a head of a small girl from Aksehir.⁶⁹ Her delicately rendered features with partially closed, swollen eyelids, fleshy full cheeks and short, rounded mouth are similar to the Apollo. Furthermore, the two statues both have fleshy necks which fold subtly forming the so-called "Venus Rings". One noticeable difference, however, is the treatment of the hair, with each lock carefully delineated compared to the coarser yet more realistically carved locks of the Apollo. The late date given to the Apollo by Flashar, of 120 B.C., is due to

⁶⁸ Flashar, 1992, 137 and for the Aphrodite bust, fig.111.

⁶⁹ Now in Istanbul Archaeological Museum, inventory number 360.

his conclusions that the piece is classicising. That this is not the case is shown by comparisons with earlier sculptures from Asia Minor.

One of the clearest parallels is with the head of a standing woman from Pergamon.⁷⁰ The face is unfortunately damaged, but enough remains of the features to reveal a comparable style and form. The fullness of the face, its fleshy structure and the heavily hooded eyes compare favourably with the head of Apollo, and the treatment of the hair is also similar with each strand curling into rich locks which condense around the ears. This particular figure has much in common with the goddesses on the Gigantomachy but is in a simpler style appropriate for a quietly standing figure. Viewed more closely, the facial features correspond better with the figures of the Telephos frieze where the heads also have a rounded, plump structure and heavily lidded eyes. This frieze, as already noted, is probably contemporary with the Gigantomachy, between 190 - 160 B.C.

Another statue from Pergamon which is closely analogous with the Apollo is the Hermaphrodite.⁷¹ The loose modelling of the flesh of the naked torsoes and the swollen abdomens are similar in both. The oval shape of the two heads is also comparable with the Hermaphrodite also having fleshy, swollen upper eyelids and a short mouth. The most obvious comparison, however, is the treatment of the hair and its arrangement. The locks of hair cling closely to the contour of the upper part of the head, but then they swell in a thick mass around the ears. The arrangement of the himation around the lower legs of the statue from Pergamon is comparable with that of the Cyrene Apollo, with both legs

⁷⁰ Winter, 1908, no.69.

⁷¹ For an illustration see Ajootian, 1990,272, no.18.

silhouetted through the thin material and a sweep of folds where the garment has slipped to frame the genitals. We can perhaps restore a similar arrangement for the statue from Tralleis with all three figures displaying homoerotic characteristics which can be detected in figures of both Apollo and Dionysos throughout the Hellenistic period.

The Hermaphrodite is best dated to the first half of the second century perhaps more closely to the period just after the Great Altar. The Pergamon Zeus is also loosely related, as all these figures combine a well developed *contrapposto* with a confident pose. The earliest the Tralleis figure could date to is around 200 B.C., but its comparisons would suggest a slightly later date of between 175 - 150 B.C. Flashar dated the original of the Cyrene Apollo to between the Great Altar at Pergamon and 120 B.C., his postulated date for the Tralleis statue. What the exact relationship is between the original from Tralleis and the copy from Cyrene is not clear. On first viewing the two statues appear to follow the same general principles of design. They both have a rather soft and fleshy treatment of the skin and an inflated abdomen. The facial features are similar, though the Cyrene statue is much harsher with clearly cut eyes, lips and hair, though the figures compare well in the structure of the face. The right cheeks are broader and the face is distorted at this angle and therefore the original statue was intended to be viewed with the head facing to the right of the figure, with the torso turning slightly in that direction and the legs almost frontal. There are, however, many differences between the two statues. The hairstyle of the Tralleis statue is distinct and does not fall in loose curls over the shoulders. The Tralleis Apollo holds his head in a much more upright position and does not turn as sharply to the right. In fact, the Tralleis Apollo appears much more like the original of the Apollo Lykeios, being more frontal and leaning much more to the left than

the Cyrene version. So how far can we say that the two images followed the same original cult statue ? It could be answered that the sculptor who carved the Tralleis figure was more imaginative, and if he did follow a famous prototype, he added much more of his own inspiration in terms of design. The richly embroidered material of the material over his shoulder shows just how accomplished the sculptor was. Few marble sculptures survive with such elaborately carved drapery; only the drapery of the Despoina at Lykosoura compares. The sculptor of the Cyrene Apollo was more interested in recreating a particular original than interpreting the prototype and using his great skill, obvious in the accomplished treatment of the drapery, anatomical features and the lively modelling of the face and hair, to produce a more vibrant and innovative image, but it has not the richly wrought characteristics of the Tralleis statue.

The Tralleis Apollo possibly functioned as a cult image, perhaps for a temple within the area of the theatre in the city. That the type could be utilised as a cult image is shown by the Apollo from Cyrene, which was placed in the temple during its refurbishment in the second century AD. The form that the temple took, however, was unusual in that it utilised the Doric order rather than the usual Roman Corinthian. This may refer back to the original temple built during the second century B.C. where a similar cult statue of Apollo may have been dedicated. Yet it is surprising that such a flamboyant and "Ionian" type of Apollo was selected for such a heavy Doric structure. Why this is so must remain a mystery. The answer perhaps lies in the original which may or may not have been the Tralleis figure.

What is difficult to determine is whether the Tralleis Apollo followed a slightly earlier, famous prototype. If it did, then this statue, possibly also a temple statue, was more than likely made for a shrine in western Asia Minor. The Tralleis statue has more parallels from sites in this region than anywhere else and, given the early date of the Apollo, it could have been the original from which the numerous, later versions were reproduced. If it was not the prototype, then it was made soon after its model, in the second quarter of the second century B.C. The colossal figure, draped in a provocative manner and with extremely feminine features, is nonetheless a vibrant image and skilfully conceived and completed with metal fixtures and lavishly carved drapery. All of this was intensified with the contrast between the smooth and fleshy skin surfaces and the rough treatment of the hair. The fusion of Dionysos and Apollo has been accomplished in the Tralleis statue and the question must remain open as to whether the figure actually depicts Apollo and not his alter ego.

For the remainder of the century there is little evidence for cult images of Artemis, but for Apollo there is reference in Pausanias to a sanctuary of Wolf Apollo at Argos.⁷¹ He tells us that the statue was made by the sculptor Attalos of Athens who may be the same sculptor who produced the acroliths for the Asklepieion at Pheneos. Pausanias claims that the Apollo was carved in his own times, that is the second century A.D. which would disagree with the date applied to the sculptor by his associations at Pheneos. Yet Pausanias may have intended to say that this figure was recent when compared to the more ancient idol and its temple, therefore this may be the same Attalos rather than a

⁷¹ Pausanias, 2.19.3.

sculptor of the Roman period. The question must remain open and, in any case, no trace of the image survives.

Overall, it would seem that the installation of cult images of Apollo, Artemis and Leto, depended greatly on the Hellenistic monarchies, particularly the Seleukid dynasty who claimed descent from Apollo and therefore nurtured his cult. The cult images of Artemis are slightly more complicated to reconstruct and coins tends to distort the picture more than they help, particularly when the portrayal of a certain image alters over the centuries. What is interesting is that we have at least the names preserved of some of the sculptors who were contracted to construct these new cult images.

Aphrodite was probably the most popular subject of all the Olympian deities in sculpture and the minor arts. During the Hellenistic period the iconography of the goddess was richly augmented by new and innovative types, works in an eclectic style and, later in the period, variations of earlier prototypes. Cult images are, however, more difficult to isolate from the many copies that were carved during the Roman period. On the other hand, original sculptures have been neglected and attempts to formulate Hellenistic types of Aphrodite have usually concentrated on surviving copies rather than using the ancient literature and original pieces of statuary. Brinkerhoff categorizes the Aphrodites of this period into several types and in this he is successful.¹ Since his study first appeared there have been important discoveries such as the excavation of the Dion cult statue. On the whole, however, there is a surprising lack of surviving cult images of the goddess, a fact rendered even more extraordinary when one considers how many temples were dedicated to Aphrodite during the Hellenistic period.

The god Ares was one of the least represented deities in the plastic arts, therefore it is impossible to illustrate his iconographical representations during the period. However, in the few instances where his cult statues are recorded, at Olus in Crete and possibly also in Thebes, they accompany, or share a temple with, Aphrodite. No other temples are known to have been dedicated to the god during the Hellenistic period.

¹ See Brinkerhoff, 1978.

The Late Classical Forerunners

Sculptors of the fourth century B.C. attempted to re-work the iconography of Aphrodite, challenging the traditional practices of representing the goddess and creating new types. The most obvious transformation was that she began to lose her garments and was, for the first time in large scale sculpture, rendered nude by Praxiteles, whose famous statue stood in a shrine at Knidos. Much has been said of this particular image, but its influence cannot be over-exaggerated as the statue generated numerous Hellenistic variants and towards the end of the second century B.C. more exact copies were manufactured.² Pliny also informs us of another statue of the goddess by Praxiteles which was semi-draped and preferred by the people of Kos to the naked figure.³ Attempts have been made to isolate possible copies of this particular statue, but without a great deal of success. The Aphrodite found at Arles and now in the Louvre has been cited as a possible replica of Praxiteles' semi-draped figure but it reveals stylistic traits which should perhaps be considered post-Praxitelean.⁴ It is possible that the original of this statue was carved by one of the sons of the late Classical master, namely Kephisodotos, whose statue eventually ended up in Rome in the collection of Asinius Pollio.⁵ What is evident is that the Knidian statue was the most likely candidate for later reproduction because of its celebrated status and it is reasonable to say that it was the most famous statue in antiquity.

² The earliest known replica of the statue was possibly made at Tralleis in western Asia Minor, see section on Apollo from Tralleis.

³ Pliny NH.36.20.

⁴ Stewart, 1990, 176-177, claims that the Arles Aphrodite is a possible reproduction of a Praxitelean figure, associating the piece with the Aberdeen head and the Leconfield Aphrodite. Ridgway, 1990,90 disagrees and classifies the piece as neo-Classical.

⁵ Pliny, NH.36.24.

Rivalling the Knidian statue, in terms of praise bestowed by Pliny, was the Aphrodite by Skopas which was also naked and often neglected by scholars in search of copies, though the Capua type has been suggested as a possible reproduction. The Parian sculptor's most famous image of the goddess, however, stood in her sanctuary on Samothrake with a figure of Pothos (Desire), but only copies of the latter statue have been identified. His other figure of the goddess was shown riding on a goat and stood in Elis.⁶ The other great, late Classical master sculptor Lysippos is not recorded as having created any statues of the goddess.

For Ares the picture is bleak indeed. Only the cult statue in a temple at Halikarnassos, probably by Leochares, is recorded for the late Classical period. Vermeule has attempted to assign a bearded head of the god now in Boston with the colossal, acrolithic original by comparing it to possible original works by the sculptor and his arguments are convincing.⁷ This type, however, seems to have been more of a model for Roman Imperial cult images of Mars. The only other reported statue of the god was by Skopas which was later to be found in Rome.⁸ The famous seated statue of Ares in the Ludovisi Museum has often been quoted as a reproduction but its appearance and style only faintly alludes to the style of that master. It has just as much in common with copies attributed to Lysippos and Leochares or may be by an unknown master. The important question is the possible location of early Hellenistic cult images of Aphrodite instead.

⁶ Pausanias, 6,25,1.

⁷ Vermeule, 1984,783-8.

⁸ Pliny, NH 36.25-6.

Few original statues survive of Aphrodite from the late fourth century B.C. This is particularly frustrating when the number of temples is considered. One might expect that those cult images carved during the last quarter of the fourth century B.C. may have been greatly influenced by the most recent statues of the goddess, particularly the Knidian statue. Though it may be fair to say that even though the work and style of Praxiteles reached into the later part of the century and beyond through his sons and pupils, the Knidian Aphrodite had not yet reached its peak of fame and that not all sculptors had seen the statue by this time. Several small temples were built for the worship of the goddess during this period but they have yielded little evidence as to the form of their cult images.

The Early Hellenistic Period

At Epidauros, at least one early Hellenistic temple was constructed for Aphrodite and Pausanias saw a temple to the goddess, but it is not clear from his brief description where it was located within the sanctuary.⁹ There are, however, problems in attempting to reconstruct a cult of Aphrodite at Epidauros. The main impediment obscuring an analysis of the goddesses' cult is that there is confusion over which temple, out of two possible candidates, belongs to her. Temple "L" is situated in the hills which surround the sanctuary and is dated to the late 4th or early 3rd century B.C. It takes the form of an Ionic pseudo-peripteral temple with a stylobate measuring 7.96 x 13.53 metres and inside the cella stood Corinthian columns. Roux believes this is the temple that Pausanias saw and attributed to the goddess.¹⁰ But another temple, which is located to the north of the

⁹ Pausanias 2,27,5.

¹⁰ Roux, 1961,240-1.

temple of Asklepios in the main sanctuary has tentatively been identified as the one Pausanias saw. Burford believes, however, that the remains of the temple in the area of the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas is the one which Pausanias saw.¹¹ It could be possible that both temples belong to Aphrodite and that Pausanias only mentioned one of them, but these are only hypotheses and should be treated with caution. What is clear is that there was a cult of Aphrodite at Epidauros which took physical shape in the form of at least one temple in the Hellenistic period, at the same time that the shrine of Artemis was also being architecturally embellished

A temple of Aphrodite is also recorded at Thebes with a fragment of literary evidence, informing us that the temple of Aphrodite Lamia was renovated in 304 - 303 B.C. and that it was restored in honour of the mistress of Demetrios Poliorcetes.¹² We know that the city was razed to the ground by Alexander's forces in 335 B.C. and, presumably, a restoration of sanctuaries will have been rendered necessary by such a catastrophe, thereby supporting a date in the later fourth century. During this period, the city was ruled by Kassander, the king of Macedon and the temple constructed may have housed the three ancient wooden cult images of the goddess that Pausanias saw.¹³ He does not, however, make any reference to a temple there. In this particular case, Demetrios may have been identified with the god Ares with Aphrodite as his consort. Other evidence for this cult may come to light in further excavations; indeed, Symeonoglou claims that the temple's foundations can be located in Thebes though he gives little evidence to support his claim.¹⁴

¹¹ Burford, 1969,73.

¹² See Symeonoglou, 1985,127.

¹³ Pausanias, 9.16.2.

¹⁴ Symeonoglou, 1985. He chooses site number 229 as a possible location for the temple.

Another late fourth century temple dedicated to Aphrodite has been located at Dodona in Epirus but, again, no fragments of the cult statue were found. All that can be surmised is that the cult statue of this temple must have been approximately life-sized, given that the structure is relatively small. There is, however, literary evidence for the cult image at one of Aphrodite's early Hellenistic sanctuaries on Delos.

The Aphrodite at Delos

At Delos a small temple was erected to Aphrodite in the last decade of the fourth century B.C. An inscription tells us that the temple was consecrated by Stesileos, who was archon in 305\302 B.C.¹⁵ During this time a festival was also inaugurated in honour of the * goddess and known as the Stesileia. There is, however, a problem in that it is recorded that Aphrodite had two sanctuaries on the island; one dedicated to Aphrodite Pandemos, the other to Aphrodite Ourania. It seems likely, however, that the temple established by Stesileos was the one excavated which borders the north edge of the theatre. This is a small building, 10.45 x 5.94 metres and consists of a pronaos and a cella. The cult statue does not survive, but a valuable inscription dated to the years 110 - 109 B.C. informs us that the cult statue was repaired during this period and also gives a brief account of the appearance of the Aphrodite. It was apparently of marble with separately attached earrings made of gold and she also held a cup of gilded wood in one hand. There is no mention of the sculptor and nothing else is known about the cult image. This is probably the statue that served the cult of Aphrodite Ourania and was possibly clothed as statues of

¹⁵ This information comes from Bruneau and Ducat, 1983,213. This general guide to the site has the Aphrodisieion situated at location number 88. *

this type invariably are.¹⁶ Other inscriptions found on the island, however, confuse the matter somewhat and mention a wooden *xoanon*, a more ancient image. This was * presumably housed in an earlier shrine, with the new marble image dedicated when the cult was revitalised by Stesileos.¹⁷

This period on Delos marked an era of independence and, understandably, the cults of the gods were promoted and sanctuaries architecturally embellished as an expression of civic pride. Because, however, the cult image does not survive, the importance of the statue and its setting are lost to us. As so often when there is interesting epigraphical evidence surrounding the inauguration of a cult image, no remnants of it survive to assist us in an archaeological and art historical examination.

So far the temples of Aphrodite have yielded only literary and archaeological evidence for Aphrodite's early Hellenistic cult statues. Another confusing case is the cult image of Aphrodite Ourania on Acrocorinth, which coins of the Roman period show as a semi-draped figure holding a shield in which to see her reflection. This example is probably not relevant here, however, as we are dealing with a cult image almost certainly installed during the period of the Roman colonisation of the city after it had been sacked in 146 B.C. An earlier cult image had shown her fully armed but the Roman replacement used a Hellenistic style statue which has been both compared to and contrasted with the Aphrodite from Capua and the Aphrodite from Melos. The statue on the coin may have

¹⁶ See Farnell, 1896,682-6.

¹⁷ See Bruneau, 1970,336 for an analysis of the major inscriptions concerned with the worship of Aphrodite.

been a late Hellenistic creation, perhaps contemporary with the Melos Aphrodite, but as Williams pointed out, there is no way of being certain.¹⁸

The Third Century B.C.

From the third century the picture is even less revealing. The naked Aphrodite may have continued in popularity and copies such as the Medici, Townley and Arles type may copy famous cult images, but it cannot be proved.¹⁹ More interesting is that a new type is introduced, possibly by the sculptor Doidalsos for king Nikomedes I of Bithynia. This the so-called Crouching type, is preserved in many copies and has a triangular, squatting pose, however, which does not seem at all suitable for a cult figure and so is of minor importance here.

One of the largest temples constructed in Aphrodite's honour was at Messa on Lesbos. This was excavated during the last century and only meagre foundations and a few architectural elements survive. The temple was pseudodipteral and of the Ionic order with 8 x 14 columns. There are differences of opinion concerning the date of its construction, with Robertson and Pfrommer preferring a date somewhere in the first quarter of the third century B.C.²⁰ There is little point in dwelling on the importance of this temple for no fragments of the cult image remain and there is no literary or numismatic evidence available to help us reconstruct its appearance. Therefore the picture for the remainder of the century is quite bleak in terms of both originals and copies. For the last decades of

¹⁸ Williams, 1986,20.

¹⁹ For the Aphrodites see Delivorrias, 1984, Medici, no.149; Townley,no.546; Arles,no.526.

²⁰ Robertson, 1988 (reprint), 145,n.1 and Pfrommer, 1986,94.

the third century and into the early second, however, the evidence is a little more revealing.

Two particularly informative types of Aphrodite are those known as the Troad and Capitoline, which although they have no fixed context, are perhaps more revealing than other Roman copies, because one has an interesting inscription about its original source, and the other can be compared with sculptures from Asia Minor. First, however, there is an important original from Rhodes to consider, related to the other two, but more informative through her Hellenistic date and also for having a possible location.

The Aphrodite from Rhodes (catalogue number 31), figs. 94-97.

An important Hellenistic original Aphrodite is an over life-sized statue of Aphrodite of the *puditia* type found just off the coast of Rhodes town. Whether it originally stood as a cult image in the small temple of the goddess is the subject of much controversy, enhanced by the lack of published information about the temple. There has been much debate concerning the original context of the figure and whether she stood in the small Ionic temple in the old city. Leveque proposed the theory that the statue may have been the cult image in the temple of Aphrodite and dates them both to the early third century B.C.²¹ Few scholars, however, would assign the statue to the temple of Aphrodite, most seeing the statue as later in date and Merker claiming that its proportions are too large for such a small building.²² The Aphrodite, however, is not of colossal proportions, but just

²¹ Leveque, 1950,68.

²² Merker, 1973,26.

over life-size, and could well have been installed in the small temple. If this is not the case she may have stood as a cult figure in another temple in the city, not yet discovered. There is little chance of proving that she did indeed function as the cult image in the city's most prominent temple to the goddess and its date is the main point of contention here. It seems necessary then to determine the date of the Aphrodite, an important original of the *puditia* type.

The surface of the figure has suffered through its submersion in the sea but enough remains to compare the figure with others and perhaps determine its date. Suggested dates, however, have been unsatisfactory and vary from the mid fourth century to the late second and so a careful examination of the piece seems warranted.²³ Another important and neglected issue is to what extent the Aphrodite is innovative in form. Her Hellenistic date should potentially permit stylistic comparisons and perhaps be more informative than the scores of later copies of *puditia* types.

Jacopi proposed that the Aphrodite was carved in the second half of the fourth century but claims that it closely copied a contemporary prototype.²⁴ He continues to propose that the original stood somewhere in Asia Minor but fails to explain his reasoning.

Presumably he would date the original not long after the Knidia by Praxiteles, but does not see the fundamental differences between the two figures, though at least, this would explain his attribution of the prototype to Asia Minor. His dating is, to some extent justified, as the facial features are vaguely Skopaic in form with deeply set, large rounded

²³ See Delivorrias, 1984, for a list of opinions concerning the date.

²⁴ Jacopi, 1931,14-15.

eyes beneath a pronounced brow and have a degree of pathos. In profile, even with the heavy smoothing down of the features, the face is also Skopaic in structure and form. The difference is that the head is small in scale in relation to the length of the body and not like the quadrilateral heads and stockier bodies of Skopas. The figure even seems to exaggerate the proportions of Lysippos, therefore is probably later in date. Furthermore, there is nothing Praxitelean about the facial features nor anything to suggest that the figure is a variant of the Knidia or an Aphrodite by one of the sons of Praxiteles. The individual strands of hair form thick layers which are kept in position by a band around the top of the head and then secured in a bun at the rear. The separately added top-knot would have elaborated the hairstyle further and compares well with one particular Hellenistic type of Aphrodite to be discussed in more detail shortly, namely the Capitoline.

If we compare it with the Capitoline statue, which corresponds well with Pergamene works, the Rhodian statue appears less dynamic in form. The head is based more directly on late Classical models, but the elongated proportions and the exaggerated sexuality of the piece, emphasised by the drapery, betray its Hellenistic date. Admittedly it is difficult to examine its style closely but the figure may be contemporary with the originals of the Capitoline and Troad types, of about 200 B.C., though showing the less inflated forms typical to sculpture from the Greek islands. The figure lacks the dynamic execution found on the Capitoline type and it is this that causes some scholars to classify the Rhodes statue as conservative and classicising, hence their late Hellenistic dating. Their arguments revolve around the elongated proportions of the figure and the tightly bound drapery around the lower legs, features that are far more common amongst late second century pieces. Bieber views the figure as derivative and classicising, and Merker, in her study of

Rhodian sculpture, hardly refers to the Aphrodite at all.²⁵ The statue has also been criticised and down-dated by Brinkerhoff in his section on the decline of the image of Aphrodite in the late Hellenistic period. He claims that the "divine presence is almost totally lost" in this statue and dates it after 150 B.C.²⁶ This condemnation of the type seems unwarranted and based on his incorrect assumption that the type of drapery employed on this statue is merely for titillation and could not have been used on a sculpture serving a religious function; a claim which will be analysed shortly.

To return, however, to the question of its date, the slim, elongated figure is distinct from the fleshier Capitoline type but is unlike the Aphrodite from Melos which dates to the last quarter of the second century, which is a heavier, more matronly figure with rather impassionate facial features. Instead the Rhodian Aphrodite has the three-dimensionality associated with the school of Lysippos and the head is turned at an angle to the body, and thereby lacking any distinct viewpoint. It is not at all clear how the statue was placed on its base, and consequently, whether her head was facing the onlooker or facing away. The most harmonious angle of viewing is from a three-quarter position to her right, in which position she turns her head away from the worshipper, a trait of late third century figures of Aphrodite. Other copies seem more directly based upon the Rhodian figure, and show the hairstyle, which is characteristic of the Capitoline type. One such reproduction, now in the Bardo Museum in Tunis, has a similar arrangement of drapery around the legs.²⁷ This statue is also informative in that it shows the original position of the hands with the right covering the breasts whilst the left secures the material around her thighs. The main

²⁵ Bieber, 1961,133 and Merker, 1973,26.

²⁶ Brinkerhoff, 1978, 231.

²⁷ See Delivorrias, 1984, plate 73, no.737.

difference, however, is that the Tunis figure is fleshier in form and has a heavier build. Another later copy was discovered at Leptis Magna in Libya, but again has a more swollen physique. The most distinctive feature is the drapery around the knees which is similar to those representations of Aphrodite of the Anadyomene type, who stand legs tightly together, and bind their wet hair.²⁸ The problem here is whether the Anadyomene type was an earlier creation than the Rhodian puditia type. This question is unfortunately impossible to answer and it is safer to assume that are contemporary creations. The most interesting characteristic of both types stems from the provocative drapery arrangement, which being present though ineffective in covering the nakedness of the goddess, is more tantalising than the totally naked Knidia or later variations such as the Capitoline and Troad types.

The drapery which covers her thighs and lower legs does not conceal her nudity but rather, in its design, shape and form, draws attention to her genital region. Moreover, the arms served to direct the line of vision even closer to her genitals and breasts. This statue presents the goddess as a sexually provocative woman, vulnerable and slightly coy yet it is all too easy to dismiss these naked Hellenistic statues of Aphrodite as decadent. Farnell makes an interesting remark that the images of the undraped goddess do not reveal a cult which is any less spiritual than Classical ones with draped statues, but rather belong to a religious idea that is more restricted and more personal to the worshippers.²⁹ The nudity also alluded to the birth of Aphrodite from the sea, and thus her associations with the ocean and maritime activities were important. Of course she was still the goddess of love

²⁸ See Delivorrias, 1984,76.

²⁹ Farnell, 1896,720.

and it would be foolish to deny that people went to see the statue to wonder at the beauty of the nude, female form as well as for religious devotion. So it cannot be forgotten that Aphrodite was the goddess who promoted "love and the joyous consummation of sexuality".³⁰ In fact the naked Aphrodites of the Hellenistic period may reveal the most spiritual and physical nature of the goddess; the Greeks were not uninspired in their production of pretty and delicate statues of Aphrodite and that they had not irrevocably lost their image of her as a divine Olympian deity because of these statues. During this period more statues of the goddess were produced than in the Classical period and the types were much more varied than the surviving copies communicate. It seems to have been fashionable in the Roman period to reproduce the nude types rather than the draped types of Aphrodite, hence the misconception that these were the most effective and popular types of the day and represented a more secular attitude towards the goddess. The originals of such copies are difficult to date, but the Rhodian statue should perhaps be easier to compare with other sculpture from the Hellenistic period. Yet apart from the Capitoline and Troad types, there is little to compare her with, though a date around the end of the third century seems likely. The sculptor was not perhaps as progressive in his choice of posture, or as dynamic in his modelling, as the sculptor who created the Capitoline Aphrodite. Yet the figure consciously eschews the more vulnerable characteristics of Praxiteles' Knidia which must have influenced the sculptor at Rhodes, but the Knidia would have appeared conservative and dated next to the Rhodes statue. Whether the original of the type can be seen in this statue or in a prototype created in Asia Minor is impossible to determine.

³⁰ Burkert, 1985,152.

Another such type which was almost certainly derived from an original in that region is preserved in the copies best exemplified by the Troad type.

The Troad type, (catalogue number 39), fig. 110.

This lack of any standard viewpoint is seen in another Aphrodite in the Terme museum. The name of the copyist is preserved on an inscription which states that he copied it from a statue which stood somewhere in the Troad. This provides us with our only example of such a sculptor naming his source of inspiration.³¹ Menophantos claims he reproduced an Aphrodite which stood in the Troad, but its exact location is not made clear.³² The many copies made of this statue betray its popularity as an original and suggests that it may have served as an important cult figure. Aphrodite's associations with the Troad do not need to be outlined here as they are well known from mythology, in episodes of the Trojan wars, but to find a location for the original of the statue is more difficult to determine. The statue has, as Felletti proposes, "a careful and diligent formula and a cold elegance".³³ She leans forward slightly more than the Capitoline type and is, therefore, less confident in her manner. On the whole, however, the Troad copy has much in common with both the Capitoline and Medici types; the fleshy, sensuous modelling and the facial features being more akin to the former than the latter. As a cult image she is obviously influenced by the Aphrodite of Praxiteles in Knidos but blends the styles of that master with a new, more voluptuous modelling of forms. This is perhaps a characteristic

³¹ The sculptor is named as Menophantos, an otherwise unknown sculptor working during the Roman period.

³² For the many copies of this type see Felletti, 1951,65.

³³ Felletti, 1951,54.

of the schools of sculpture in Asia Minor towards the end of the third century. The Capitoline and Troad copies both share a motivation and inspiration which seem to be the result of a fusion of stylistic trends. Here the images of Aphrodite emulate those of Praxiteles and his followers, but in addition have a more flamboyant arrangement of the hair and drapery and an emphasis on creating a seductive, naked female form. The Capitoline type is a fine and interesting link between the late third century and the first half of the second century B.C. when Pergamon became a chief centre in the production of sculpture.

The Second Century B.C.

As the Hellenistic period progressed, Aphrodite became an ever more popular subject for sculptors and temples continued to be built in her honour. The *puditia* type continues and is elaborated upon by sculptors working in the cities of Asia Minor, while on the mainland of Greece a new and draped figure was also beginning to emerge as another favoured type for representing the goddess.

The Capitoline type, (catalogue number 40), fig. 111.

The Capitoline Aphrodite is somewhat problematical in that its date and original location has never been adequately decided. The flamboyant drapery, the plump and round forms of the body and the elaborate hairstyle have many affinities with the Baroque school of sculpture which was prominent in the latter quarter of the 3rd century and into the second century B.C. She is similar to the goddesses on the Great Altar frieze and also to the

Crouching Aphrodite, which is perhaps also a product of Asia Minor.³⁴ The Pergamene school was the most prolific of the workshops which popularised this style. The site of Pergamon, however, has produced very few figures of Aphrodite, the most important being the goddess on the Great Altar Frieze. Free-standing statues of the goddess are rare and the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Pergamon has not been securely identified, as it lay outside the city's walls in an area which is now under the modern town of Bergama. Two figures of Aphrodite have been excavated at the site, one is a small statuette of the "Genetrix" type which reveals the great affection for Classical models so typical amongst sculptors in the city.³⁵ The other is a large fragment, consisting of the head and shoulders of an Aphrodite with many similar features to the Capitoline type.³⁶ Yet the fragment, consisting of a battered head, upper chest and shoulders shows that it does not come from one of the numerous standing draped female figures from the city but from a statue of the naked Aphrodite. The hairstyle and the downward tilt of the head are identical to that of the Capitoline type, but the fragment is possibly Hellenistic in date. Therefore this fragment is either the remains of a figure similar to the Capitoline Aphrodite or a contemporary reproduction of the prototype. This find alone is not sufficient evidence to say that the original of the Capitoline type was a product of the sculptors working at Pergamon, but it may indicate that the original stood somewhere in western Asia Minor. Overall stylistic comparisons would date the figure to the period of the Great Altar's construction, perhaps a little earlier, around 200 B.C.

³⁴ See particularly the Crouching Aphrodite now in Naples who has the same elaborate top knot and long tresses of hair, as well as the full, voluptuous body. For the Naples Aphrodite see Stewart, 1990, plate 719.

³⁵ Winter, 1908, no.39.

³⁶ Winter, 1908, no.97.

The Dion/Agora type, (catalogue numbers 18 and 32), figs. 58 and 98-100.

Two draped figures of Aphrodite form perhaps the most interesting part of this section, the one from Dion being the only cult image with a definite context. The two large marble statues follow a type which was a popular model for Hellenistic goddesses which is known through a series of small scale variants under the title the Artemis/Hekate type which was common in the eastern Aegean. As the two largest variants of the type, both the Dion and Athenian Agora examples deserve particular attention.

The statue of Aphrodite found in recent years at Dion has a fixed context and can be dated to the first half of the second century B.C. The Athens example was not excavated in a temple but may have originally served a ritual function in a shrine. Harrison proposes that this particular figure was the prototype for the many later copies but until more work is carried out on the recently excavated shrine at Dion and its date firmly established this suggestion will have to remain conjecture.³⁷ The finest of the two figures in terms of style and quality is the headless one found in Athens, which may have been one of the two statues of Aphrodite which Pausanias saw in the Temple of Ares in the Agora.³⁸ Harrison, however, has recently suggested that the statue from Athens was the cult figure in the sanctuary of Aphrodite Hegemone, situated in the northern sector of the Agora and that, when this sanctuary was destroyed in Sulla's sack, the statue was rehoused in the temple of Ares. The shrine of Aphrodite Hegemone consisted, not of a temple, but an altar dedicated to the goddess and the Three Graces and it was dedicated in

³⁷ Harrison, 1991,346.

³⁸ Pausanias, 1,8,5. This figure was found along with another Aphrodite of fifth century date in the Herulian wall amidst fragments of the temple of Ares.

197/6 B.C. Whether the style of the statue and this date correspond will require critical stylistic analysis and comparison with dated works.

First and importantly, the statue appears to have been carved by a sculptor who was aware of the drapery techniques favoured by Pergamene sculptors. Most evidence for this type, however, comes from Rhodes where there are numerous similar examples, some of which may represent Artemis/Hekate rather than Aphrodite.³⁹ The two large examples from Athens and Dion are better comparisons than the numerous, smaller replicas and can also be paralleled with terracotta and other marble figures.

In general, the clinging material of the chiton over the upper body refers back to late fifth and fourth century figures. The widely spaced breasts which stretch the material tautly over the upper body are similar to the copies best exemplified by the Hera Barberini and a statue in Vienna, perhaps also of Hera.⁴⁰ This is similar to the Agora statue but the high girdle, plastic treatment of the drapery and the massive forms betray the Athenian statue's high Hellenistic date. How far the earlier Classical figures influenced the latter cannot be determined, and it may be more appropriate to search for later statues with a similar plastic treatment of the drapery and bodily forms. Harrison claims that the statue is classicising and based on fourth century models, though she provides no parallels.⁴¹

³⁹ See Gualandi, 1969.

⁴⁰ For the Hera Barberini type see Bieber, 1977, plate 29 and the Vienna statue see Susserot, 1938, 139, plate 28 no.4.

⁴¹ Harrison, 1991, 346.

One of the most prominent and Hellenistic features of this type is the exaggerated *contrapposto* of the stance with the shift of weight from the raised right leg to the standing left. The resulting effect is that the left hip projects out and is covered with almost vertical pleats of material, and this idea is heightened further by the tight girdle which narrows the waist. This posture can be seen in terracotta figurines, particularly one from Myrina showing an Aphrodite leaning on a pillar and a large statuette of the same goddess from Priene.⁴² A similar feature is the revealing chiton which clings to the upper body with the girdle stretching the material over the rounded forms. A combination of these factors creates an extremely sensuous feminine form with the graceful spreading of the fingers over the projecting hip. The Myrina figure is our only real dating device as production at the site commenced only late in the third century B.C. and continued into the second. The style was also popular at Pergamon where one of the female figures exhibits similar stylistic tendencies.⁴³ The high girdled chiton has a comparable texture consisting of fine pleats which contrast superbly with the heavier material of the himation. The Pergamon figure also retains the well defined *contrapposto* resulting in the projection of the right hip. A more famous comparison is with the Nike of Samothrake where the plastic treatment of the chiton and the textural contrast of the himation are not unlike the above examples. An even more convincing stylistic parallel is found in the diaphanous chiton clinging to the widely spaced breasts which compare well with the Agora example in particular. The date of the Athenian statue is probably about 200 - 160 B.C., which ties in with that of the Myrina figure and the date of the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Dion.

⁴² For the Myrina statuette (now in the National Museum Athens) see Horn, 1938, plate 30, no.2. The Priene figure is now in Berlin, see Wiegand and Schrader, 1904,351, fig.416.

⁴³ See Winter, 1908,87, no.53, plate 20.

There seems no doubt that the production of the type falls within this period and that this particular model was common to many regions.

The question remains, however, where did the style of the Agora/Dion type originate:

Athens, Rhodes (where many figures show a similar drapery arrangement and posture) or western Asia Minor, exemplified by statues from Pergamon, Priene and Myrina ?

Athenian coroplasts may also have worked at Myrina and reproduced larger marble works in miniature form or may have been inspired by marble prototypes. The Nike of Samothrake has been considered Rhodian, but most of the small scale marble variants of the Agora/Dion type from Rhodes do not exhibit such a diaphanous treatment of the chiton. Another prime example of this transparent handling of the chiton is the colossal Demeter at Lykosoura, an example which extends the style into the Peloponnese in the same period. It appears this style was a popular choice for representations of goddesses during the late third to early second century B.C. What is uncertain is whether the Dion statue precedes or post dates the Agora example which Harrison believes to be the prototype. The Athens example is of such fine quality that it is difficult to believe that it could have been worked later than the Dion statue; perhaps therefore, the Athens example was the originator of the type and was carved by an Attic sculptor who had incorporated the dynamic style prevalent in Asia Minor.

The Dion statue, in contrast to the Athenian figure, preserves her head, though this was made separately and attached at a rather unusual point, just below the start of the neck.

The main characteristics of the shape of the face and its delicate features reveal an enormous debt to Praxiteles and his followers. The triangular forehead, with the smooth

transition from brow to the orbital ridge is extremely close to female Praxitelean heads. Even closer are the heads of the Muses on the base from Mantinea which also have a similar hairstyle.⁴⁴ This Athenian connection is enhanced by the Dion Aphrodite's close resemblance to some of the female figures on late fourth century grave stelai with the poise and angle of the head being the most obvious parallel. It could be considered then that the sculptor of this image and possibly the type was conservative in style. Yet the whole effect of the figure, combining a Praxitelean head and an elaborate hairstyle with a thoroughly Hellenistic body, is not as eclectic as it sounds, but rather original and successful, perhaps explaining the popularity of the type. Given these factors, the sculptor of the Agora type was probably an Athenian and it was he who created the type followed so exquisitely at Dion shortly after. Only at Dion did the copyist alter a few features such as the arrangement of drapery over the right arm, which differs from the Agora example, by revealing a short sleeve and cord under the arm. In conclusion the Dion and Agora types are charming pieces, the Dion variant being somewhat more delicate; the Agora prototype more stately and sumptuous. Their date must be almost identical and comparative pieces would suggest the first half of the second century, probably earlier rather than later as a suitable date. It remains to discuss the function and historical circumstances of the Dion cult image.

At Dion the statue served the cult of Aphrodite Hypolympidia, that is Aphrodite at the foot of Olympos. Thus she is the all powerful Olympian goddess who governs the forces of love and this cult image is amongst the most successfully conceived of all of her cult images during the Hellenistic period. It combines evocative sexuality with the relentless

⁴⁴ See Stewart, 1990, plate 492-3.

authority of a major Greek deity. Like many other Aphrodites of the period, however, she inclines her head and turns it away from the spectator. There is no visual contact with the onlooker; the goddess is aloof and removed from her devotees. This seems to contrast with Aphrodite's close relationship with man.

Finally, of great interest is the inscription on the base on which she stood, and her relationship with Isis, in whose sanctuary this small shrine was located. According to the inscription, the cult image was dedicated as an offering to the goddess by a wealthy woman named Anthestias Ioukoundas, a native of Dion, and interestingly, a * freedwoman.⁴⁵ If this inscription has been correctly understood, and there is little reason to doubt this, then this is our only known example of a Hellenistic cult image being dedicated, and probably financed, by a private, non-royal individual. Furthermore, it is the first instance of a non-royal female presenting a cult statue, but this is not totally surprising, however, when we consider the nature of the sanctuary as a whole. It belonged to Isis, whose headless cult image survives also, with Aphrodite's shrine occupying only a small area of the complex. The cult of both goddesses was an important element in the ritual life of women, the Egyptian goddess having a similar chthonic nature as Demeter who was in certain cults assimilated with Isis. The role Aphrodite played is not entirely clear, but was often associated with Isis during the Hellenistic period. At Alexandria she and Demeter were the two most significant Olympian goddesses, whom the Ptolemaic queens strived to emulate in their portraits and in their cult titles. In iconographical terms, the Aphrodite of Dion has retained her Olympian characteristics and it is possible, though perhaps controversial to suggest, that in this cult statue she was clothed because it was a

⁴⁵ See Pandermalis, 1981,62-3.

cult orientated specifically towards women rather than the male dominated maritime cults where the goddess was shown naked. This is, of course, speculative but is an interesting hypothesis. Perhaps the chthonic nature of Aphrodite was the intention here, with a naked image perhaps being unsuitable for such a sombre cult. If this was the case then Harrison's proposal that the Agora example served a chthonic cult appears more attractive.

The Agora example, if it indeed functioned as a cult figure, may have served the cult of Aphrodite Hegemone, an epithet often associated with the chthonic deities but also, as Harrison points out, as a saviour title in a military and political context. If the Agora statue was a cult statue, it would be interesting that the same type could serve two different cults of the goddess as well as possibly a different goddess Artemis-Hekate on Rhodes. Yet again the chthonic nature of this type of cult image is highlighted with its associations with Hekate, another goddess with underworld connotations. Given the popularity of the type, if there was a single prototype it must have been famous and therefore have stood in a prominent shrine of the goddess. Athens was much visited throughout the Hellenistic period and Dion was the major centre for Macedonian worship, so either site may have produced the original, but Athens seems the more likely of the two. What is particularly interesting about the Dion/Agora type is that it shows that the goddess was not exclusively portrayed in a state of undress. The sensuality of Aphrodite is as successfully generated in this design as in the scores of Knidia variants which followed in the Roman period.

For the remainder of the second century we have little physical evidence, but the continuing popularity of the goddess is testified by the accounts of the building of more temples. Three temples are known to have been dedicated to Aphrodite in the second century, at Kos and Megalopolis and at Boura. At Kos she was worshipped under the title Aphrodite Pandemos, "of the people", but the cult image is lost. At Megalopolis we again lack any physical remains of the cult image but Pausanias gives us a valuable description of the cult images in the temple.

Aphrodite and Hermes at Megalopolis

At Megalopolis Pausanias describes the offerings and statues inside the Sanctuary of Aphrodite Machanatis "the Contriver".⁴⁶ Inside the temple there were two cult images showing Hermes and Aphrodite, both of which were the work of Damophon of Messene. No trace of the cult images has been recovered and we know nothing more than that which Pausanias tells us about the appearance of the statues. It is the Aphrodite which is of interest here and we know that she was constructed in the acrolithic technique with the hands, face and feet carved in marble and the remainder of the figure in wood: the Hermes was carved entirely in marble. From this valuable, if somewhat brief description of the statue, it is possible to determine one important compositional element of Damophon's Aphrodite; that it was presumably clothed. A large scale, naked statue in the acrolithic technique would be unparalleled and would also have appeared ungainly and awkward, with the naked parts rendered in two different materials. Damophon was renowned for his skill in piecing together statues from separate parts and it is his skillful assembly of the

⁴⁶ Pausanias, 8,31,6.

cult figures of Demeter and Despoina at Lykosoura which causes Pausanias to claim erroneously that they were carved from one large block of marble.⁴⁷ The sculptor must have been meticulous in concealing all the joints between assembled parts of the body, so it appears more reasonable to restore his Aphrodite with drapery of carved painted wood.

We are given no indication of the dimensions of the Aphrodite at Megalopolis but from an understanding of the acrolithic technique and, from what we know of Damophon's other cult images, it was probably of colossal proportions. Thus we may be dealing with the largest of Aphrodite's cult images on the mainland of Greece. We also have no information concerning the pose of the statue, whether it was seated or standing, but from our knowledge of Damophon's work, it seems he favoured seated female deities. The importance of this statue is that it reveals that large scale cult statues were still being commissioned for temples on the mainland of Greece. The Aphrodite and Hermes at Megalopolis are examples of the revival of the acrolithic technique, a practice perhaps re-popularised by Damophon whose many contracts to produce cult images in the late third to early second century were commissions from cities eager to revitalise their civic pride. The acrolithic technique must have evoked memories of the colossal fifth century cult, chryselephantine images, but in style their Hellenistic counterparts were products of a new age, and were modern in every respect.

⁴⁷ Pausanias, 8,37,3.

The Aphrodite of Eukleides at Boura

Pausanias is our only source for another Hellenistic Aphrodite in the Peloponnese which stood in the temple at Boura in Achaia. He informs us that it was of Pentelic marble and that it was the work of the Athenian sculptor Eukleides. Eukleides appears to have been the principal sculptor in the city, with four of the major temples there containing cult images by the master. We know little about the Aphrodite and our only evidence concerning statues of Aphrodite at Boura is an image of her on a coin of that city which shows her semi-draped.⁴⁸ This may well show the cult statue by Eukleides and, had this statue survived, it would have thrown new light on a sculptor who has previously been labelled classicising.

Another later second century temple was constructed at Ellenika on Crete where Aphrodite was worshipped in conjunction with Ares. An ancient temple, near the harbour there, was rebuilt in poros limestone in the latter half of the second century B.C., when twin cellas were constructed to accommodate the cults of both of the deities. The Cretan site revealed that her temple and cult was shared with Ares, though with the cult figures placed in the separate cellas. Unfortunately, neither of the cult statues has survived and we know nothing of their appearance. The temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias, dated to the first century B.C., falls just outside the period of this study and belongs to the period of Roman domination in Asia Minor.

⁴⁸ See Imhoof-Blumer, 1964, plate V,8.

In conclusion, there were various types of statue of Aphrodite which served as cult images, though it is not easy to determine any chronological or regional groupings, or whether semi-draped or naked *puditia* types were created alongside draped figures. A thorough study of cult images of Aphrodite in this period is hampered by the lack of original pieces found in the temples in which they had been dedicated.

Athena's continued popularity throughout the Hellenistic period is attested by the numerous temples erected in her honour. New temples were raised in major cities all over the Aegean and in western Asia Minor, though unfortunately few remnants of her cult images have been recovered, and those that do survive are extremely fragmentary and stylistically uninformative. The picture is not entirely bleak, however, because Athena was adopted as the patron or principal deity by several new cities, and therefore her image frequently appears on coinage, for example at Ilion, Pergamon, Priene and at Elatea. What is difficult to determine is whether those images of Athena placed on coinage were accurate reproductions of the major cult statues in the city or whether generic types of the goddess in sculpture were used. As Carter points out in his discussion about the Athena Polias at Priene, cities utilised the image of the Parthenos in Athens whether they had a copy of the statue in their city or not.¹ So it is not always clear whether or not coins reproduce actual statues in the city's temples. A vital element of Athena's Hellenistic iconography is the importance of the Parthenos as a model for later cult images of the goddess. This will be analyzed in more depth later, but it is possible that the Phidian statue in Athens was exploited by later sculptors for its general appearance, posture and attributes but that these did not fastidiously imitate the original. On the whole the later Hellenistic temples of Athena are not built on a colossal scale, like the Parthenon, and thus the sculptors would have to had to scale down their statues to accommodate the proportions of the cella. That the cult of Athena had not declined in popularity is obvious from the physical remains of her sanctuaries, and from literary and numismatic evidence.

¹ Carter, 1983,219.

In the late Classical period she was a prevalent feature in the sculptor's repertoire and her iconography continued to develop during this period. Whether Hellenistic sculptors extended this repertoire provides an interesting line of enquiry.

The Late Classical Forerunners

Famous Classical statues of Athena existed in temples throughout the Greek mainland and islands and it is not easy to determine the extent to which these were used as prototypes as few later, original statues of the goddess survive. There are, of course, many copies of statues of Athena, but these are mostly of fifth century originals. Fewer temples were built and dedicated to her in the fourth century B.C.; a major late Classical temple was built at Tegea but this replaced an earlier structure and its ancient cult statue survived and was re-housed in the new temple. The significance of this ancient wooden *xoanon* will be of some relevance when the cult statue of Athena Polias at Pergamon is discussed shortly. Skopas was responsible for the re-furbishment of the temple at Tegea with sculpture and he was responsible for two cult images of Athena that have been recorded in ancient sources; one at Thebes and another at Knidos.² Neither original has survived and no copies have been identified. Euphranor created another famous bronze Athena which was later to be seen in Rome, which is now lost.³ The only large scale original from the mid fourth century is the bronze Athena found at Piraeus. This statue has not been universally accepted as late Classical and some believe it is a Roman copy or at least a late Hellenistic creation.⁴ Overall the scarcity of evidence means that we must rely on

² For the Theban Athena see Pausanias, 9.10.2 and for the Knidian statue see Pliny, NH.36.20-21.

³ Pliny, NH.34.77.

⁴ See Palagia, 1980,21-3.

coinage, relief carvings and even terracotta figurines to attempt to reconstruct certain cult images. The late fourth century and third centuries are completely devoid of any sculptural remains which could belong to cult images of Athena; this is particularly frustrating, given that several important temples were constructed for Athena during this period.

The Early Hellenistic period

The late Classical temple at Lindos on Rhodes lies just outside the period of this study and the cult image is, in any case, lost. The first Hellenistic temple of Athena was built at Ilion, though an earlier cult image was re-housed. The slightly later temple at Pergamon, however, is better documented and more is known about the lost cult image. At the turn of the century a new temple of Athena was built at Ilion. Strabo informs us, that the cult was encouraged by Lysimachos at the end of the fourth century or early third century B.C.⁵ Inscriptions reveal that a sanctuary to Athena was active in the third century and * that Alexander the Great is thought to have earlier donated 1500 talents to the sanctuary. The temple was of the Doric order with 6 x 12 columns, while the style of the carved metopes, supports an early third century date according to Holden.⁶ It is very likely that there was a Classical predecessor to the present temple but it is not certain whether it was still standing in the age of Alexander. As at Lindos the temple replaced an earlier structure and it is unnecessary here to dwell on the appearance of the cult image as we know that the ancient wooden statue of Athena survived the fire which destroyed the

⁵ Strabo, 13,1,26.

⁶ Holden, 1964,29-31.

earlier temple.⁷ That a new image was not commissioned to stand with the ancient *xoanon* is indicated by a coin dating to the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161 - 180 A.D.).⁸ The reverse of this coin shows the temple of Athena with the cult image standing inside. The statue is clearly Archaic in form and supports the tradition that the wooden image survived until at least the second century after Christ.

The Athena Polias at Pergamon

In the early decades of the third century we find an interesting example of a newly founded Hellenistic city, not possessing an ancient wooden image of Athena, but commissioning a new cult statue in an Archaising manner. The cult statue of Athena Polias at Pergamon was probably the first cult image commissioned by the Attalid king Philetairos. The cult statue has not survived, but it is likely that the treasuries of the city used this important statue on their coinage to promote the dedication of the temple and its image.

Athena had her main sanctuary on the Acropolis, and hers was the first major temple to be dedicated in the Pergamene citadel by Philetairos in the early third century B.C. The plan of the temple consisted of 6 x 10 columns and its use of Doric, an outright rejection of the traditional Ionic of Asia Minor, has been seen as a direct attempt to emulate the Athenian Parthenon. This is also to be witnessed in the colossal statue found in the library of

⁷ See Blinkenberg, 1917 for a discussion of the ancient cult image.

⁸ For this coin see Bellinger, 1961, T146, plate 7.

Athena which is an adaptation of Phidias's Athena in Athens; the Attalids thus wanted to be recognised as Greek in every sense.

The entrance to the temenos of Athena was a two storeyed propylon, the dedication of * which, by Eumenes II, is attested in an inscription. He also dedicated the aforementioned library and statue of Athena on the north side of the temenos. The goddess was also honoured with a colossal statue, that stood on a circular base in her precinct, as Athena Nikephoros, which Attalos I commissioned in the third quarter of the third century after the defeat of the Gauls. Just as the Athenians erected their statue of Athena on the Acropolis after the defeat of the Persians in the first half of the fifth century, the Pergamenes erected a similar monument to celebrate their victory over uncivilised nations. A festival and a shrine to the goddess in this guise was founded by Eumenes II. Thus the city of Pergamon declared Athena to be the patron goddess of the city, in a deliberate attempt to be accepted as the Hellenistic Athens.

Both Hansen and Schober believe that the Athena Polias is reproduced on a small relief found in excavations in the city.⁹ The goddess stands in a strictly hieratical position on a small pedestal, her body frontal, with rigidly inert legs creating an equilibrium and balance which is a distinctive feature of Archaic sculpture. The weight is borne on both legs and the feet are together. She carries a shield in her left hand whilst the right is raised and probably held a spear. Hansen noted the presence of a textile hanging from the shield which is not clear on the damaged relief.¹⁰ This material may have been carved onto the

⁹ Hansen, 1971,447 and Schober, 1951,49, plate 5. For the relief see Winter, 1908, 270-1, fig.37.

¹⁰ Hansen, 1971,447.

statue or may indicate an actual material placed over the image. It appears that many of the archaic *xoana* were draped with clothes or textiles; an obvious example being the ancient olive wood image of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis. The sculptor of the relief has also plainly indicated the texture of the garments of Athena. She wears a chiton which is only discernible around the ankles and over this wears a long, thick tunic which has the appearance of an animal skin. Her Aegis is also present, but its exact position over the upper body is unclear. Schalles notes the presence of a chlamys also, again not immediately obvious from the relief or on the coins, and he claims that the hem of this garment is decorated with a swallow tail fringe. Schalles believes that the statue follows the Palladion type of Athena and that its greatest influence was the archaic Athena Ilios image at Ilios.¹¹

The head of Athena on the Pergamene relief is poorly preserved, but it is clear that she wears a large Corinthian helmet which allows two ringlets of hair to lie on her shoulders; yet another characteristic alluding to Archaic korai. An interesting inconsistency between the coin reproductions and that of the relief is the type of head gear worn by the goddess. On the coins she wears a polos yet on the relief she is crowned with a Corinthian helmet. In his detailed account of the significance of the Pergamene cult image, Schalles concludes that the relief is a more accurate rendition of the Athena, whereas the coins aim to highlight a more ancient image, with the polos being used as an indication of antiquity.¹² The ancient image of Athena Lindia on Rhodes and possibly its late Classical replacement also wore the polos perhaps for the same reasons. This is a clear

¹¹ For the account of the importance of the Pergamon cult statue of Athena as a tool for promoting the antiquity of the cult see Schalles, 1985,13-17.

¹² Schalles, 1985,14.

demonstration of the determination of the Attalid kings that their city should be considered the Athens of the east.

Overall there is a strong sense of suspended animation in Athena's posture. There is movement, but the sculptor intentionally arrested this using the static arrangement of drapery and the stiff positioning of the limbs. If this relief figure does indeed reproduce the cult image of Athena Polias, which appears likely, then it was perhaps one of the first examples of archaizing Hellenistic sculpture. Later in the first century B.C. this style became more common particularly with works produced for Roman patrons.¹³

At Pergamon the reason for the archaizing appearance of the cult statue was motivated by propaganda. The Pergamenes maintained that the cult of Athena was introduced to the city by Auge, the mother of Telephos, the legendary founder of the city. To legitimise and root it solidly in antiquity, it was reported that Auge had brought to Pergamon the ancient cult image of Athena Alea from Tegea in Arkadia. This perhaps betrays the Pergamenes' lack of tradition and history in as much as they felt it necessary to authenticate their cult of Athena; the claim that a famous and primitive cult image was, in legend, brought to the city, was intended to provide the model for the later, early Hellenistic cult statue of the goddess. It is clear that the cult statue at Tegea may have inspired the appearance of the Athena Polias at Pergamon. Rather than choosing the more recent types of Athena, an older and more venerated idol was the basis for their city goddess who was later to become the patron deity of the city.

¹³ For Archaistic sculpture in general see Pollitt, 1986, 175-184 and Fullerton, 1990.

Surviving statues of Athena from the city reveal similar stylistic traits to those of the archaizing cult image. A large statue of the goddess found in her sanctuary is probably a Hellenistic original inspired, but not a direct copy of a fifth century original.¹⁴ The statue, representing Athena wearing a crossed aegis, has facial features with parallels on the Parthenon frieze and copies of works associated with Phidias and Alkamenes.¹⁵ Another statue found in the east baths of the Gymnasium also portrays the goddess in her Classical garments, wearing a simple peplos with a large overfold.¹⁶ This statue was clearly designed to emulate famous fifth century masterpieces, particularly Athenian works, and shows a simple treatment of the garments and a Polykleitan pose. The most conspicuous surviving monument to Athena found at Pergamon is the colossal variant of the Athena Parthenos found in the Library built during the reign of Eumenes II.¹⁷ This is the most visually satisfying of all variants of the Athena Parthenos and probably one of the earliest adaptations of Phidias' original. The Pergamene example was erected in a niche in the interior walls of the Library as a symbol of learning, rather than as a ritual statue. The Attalid kings had been taught in the Athenian schools of philosophy and had probably seen the Parthenos in her temple; at Pergamon, therefore, the Parthenos performed a peaceful function, one of bringing wisdom rather than political and military power, the latter qualities already exemplified by the archaizing cult image in her temple. It is an interesting use of a Classical cult statue being adapted to a slightly different function. Finally, another allusion to Athens was the colossal statue of Athena Promachos

¹⁴ For this statue, found behind the north stoa of the sanctuary, see Winter, 1908,I,no.22, 13-25.

¹⁵ See Kraemer, 1925,67-106, for an account of the so-called classicising works at Pergamon.

¹⁶ Schober, 1951,140, figs.136-138. The author dates the original to the end of the fifth century B.C.

¹⁷ See Winter, 1908,no.24, 33-46, plate VIII.

which was probably erected on the large, circular base discovered in the sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon.¹⁸

The importance of these three statues of Athena is that they are all modelled on, or at least inspired by, earlier stylistic phases in sculpture. It is clear that other deities at Pergamon were represented in a traditional manner, but usually elements of the Pergamene preference for vitality and dynamism in the modelling of hair, drapery and surface features are evident.¹⁹ In Athena's statues, however, there is a deliberate attempt to revive Archaic and Classical styles and to adhere to them more strictly. The cult of Athena had to be seen as ancient and sculpture was the most important medium through which this policy manifested itself. It seems clear that the dynasts at Pergamon aimed to use the iconography of Athena to emphasize the Greek nature of their city, and all known examples of Athena at Pergamon are carved with a great sense of the Classical masters of the fifth century. This political strategy was perhaps meant to deceive distinguished visitors who may have believed some of the statues to be Classical originals by Phidias; alternatively the kings may have hoped that Athena's images would re-create the political power that Athens had enjoyed in the decades preceding the Peloponnesian wars.

The Second Century B.C.

Two other important temples to Athena were rebuilt at the turn of the third to second centuries B.C. These both stood on Rhodes, at Kameiros and Ialysos, but it is not clear

¹⁸ Evidence for the dedication of such a statue at Pergamon can be found in Schalles, 1985, 53-4.

¹⁹ For example the statues of Demeter, Zeus, Kybele and probably the Asklepios by Phyromachos.

whether new images were dedicated or the old ones remained. The significance of this rebuilding programme is that it shows, along with the extensive alterations to the sanctuary at Lindos, the prominence of Athena's cult on the island. All the major cities deemed it essential to have their temples to the city goddess Athena, though no more can be said concerning the use or types of cult images on the island. For the rest of the second century there are two major cult images of Athena of which fragments survive; on the Greek mainland at Elatea in Phokis, and in Asia Minor at Priene.

The Athena Polias at Priene (catalogue number 19), figs. 59-64 and 127.

The cult image of Athena Polias at Priene was dedicated almost two centuries after the construction of the temple in which it was housed. It is not clear why there was such a long delay in erecting the cult image and we can only hypothesize that either an earlier image existed, but was destroyed or removed in the second century B.C. or, alternatively, that, for some unknown reason, the temple was without a cult image for that period. The patron deity of the city was Athena Polias, whose temple had been constructed by Pytheos in the late Classical period. The Ionic temple, 37.0 x 19.5 metres with its 6 x 11 columns, still dominates the city, and is one of the finest of all temples in Asia Minor. The altar of Athena, which lay to the east of the temple, was elaborate in design with sculptured figures around its length.²⁰ There are numerous other dedications surviving or attested by inscriptions to Athena in her sanctuary. Statue bases of the third and second century * which litter the site, inform us of their donors. These attest the flourishing of the cult of Athena during the Hellenistic period.

²⁰ See Carter, 1983, 181-209.

The sculpture from the sanctuary of Athena, including the cult image, has been the subject of a detailed study by Carter, and there is not the scope in this study to analyze each cult image in as much detail. The little that remains of the cult image renders stylistic comparisons almost impossible, but a reconstruction is facilitated by the additional information provided by coins issued by the city treasuries during the Roman period. Carter's reconstruction is impressive and takes into account the existing fragments and the evidence from dowel holes and fixtures to create the most accurate posture for the acrolith. Two elements of the statue merit particular examination; potential models, namely the Parthenos of Phidias and, secondly, the assembly technique of the piece. First, however, some comments should be made on the financing of the statue.

It is generally assumed that the Athena was financed by a gift of 400 talents from the Cappadocian usurper king Orophernes. His donation is probably to be dated to his years of absolute rule, between 158-7 B.C. His generosity was perhaps a result of the fact that the people of Priene had preserved his personal funds for a great number of years, and in return, had been granted enough money to complete the temple with its cult image.²¹

There seems little reason to doubt that Orophernes was a major benefactor in the city, but apart from the coins bearing his portrait found beneath the cult statue base, there is little proof that he paid for the cult image.

The name of the sculptor has not been preserved, but it appears that the city favoured an image that would appear rather traditional and thus perhaps imposed conditions requiring a reworking of the Athena Parthenos in Athens. The coin and the fragments show that the

²¹ For a detailed account of the donation by Orophernes see Carter, 1983,233-237.

sculptor followed these conditions in as far as the statue follows the general iconographical scheme of the Parthenos, but in details it probably diverges from its prototype. The similarities include the existence of a Nike in the composition, fragments of whose bronze wings survive, and the fact that the Priene statue also had a shield by her right side, which may or may not have been carved with an Amazonomachy scene. The general pose is similar but the head of the Priene image turned slightly to the figure's left. The most obvious difference, however, is in the headgear. The Parthenos wore an elaborate helmet with griffins reclining at the sides and a central, crouching sphinx, and this feature is preserved on the variants of the Parthenos; the replacing of this helmet with the simple Corinthian type is a significant alteration at Priene.²² Leipen attempts to explain the differences between the copies by suggesting that there would have been limited access to the Parthenon statue and that many of the sculptors would have been compelled to work from either memory, sketches or from other copies. Yet this does not seem entirely correct as the Phidian Parthenos was a famous image and for a sculptor in the second century to choose a completely different helmet type, surely indicates that the Athenian statue was not his only model. In fact the Priene statue seems more inspired by post-Phidian prototypes which tended to have Corinthian helmets and not Attic types.²³

Furthermore the Phidian statue was not necessarily a good choice for later cult images. It is not surprising to see the Athena Parthenos as a model of political and economic power, as it had been erected at a time when Athens was the predominant Aegean power, but was the Parthenos considered a cult image in the first place ? The Parthenon was constructed

²² For the many copies of the Parthenos see Leipen, 1971.

²³ See for example the Velletri type, Demargne, 1984, no.247.

as both the house for the cult image and as a treasury. The most sacred cult image was the olive wood statue of Athena Polias later housed in the Erechtheion. This Athena was the focus of ritual worship and the idol was clothed in the consecrated robes during the Panathenaic festivals. Phidias' statue was not, therefore, the principal image of the goddess on the Acropolis and it functioned more as a large votive offering to the goddess, a symbol of the great wealth and power of Athens in the Periklean period. It seems that other cities in Asia Minor undertook to produce cult statues of the goddess in an archaizing manner in an attempt to make the cult seem more deeply rooted in history. At Priene, however, the statue was not only inspired by the Phidian masterpiece, which was not strictly a cult image, but also by other Athenas and must also have contained Hellenistic features, perhaps in the modelling of the wooden drapery and facial features. On the whole, however, eastern rulers enjoyed cordial relations with Athens during the Hellenistic period and sought intellectual, and perhaps spiritual, enlightenment in the city; it is probably not surprising, therefore, that the greatest symbol of Athens, the Parthenos, was the subject of so many later copies in the cities of Asia Minor. But it is important to remember that the Phidian statue did not receive the name Parthenos until a later date and that it was originally an Athena Polias, protectress of the city.²⁴ One further point is that both temples of Athena, at Priene and Athens, served as treasuries and it is this factor that may have enabled the people of Priene to maintain their temple before the cult image was installed. Without this function, as a deposit of wealth, the temple without a statue would have served no obvious purpose. The question of the original functions of statues is fraught with difficulties, but it is interesting here to try to justify the use of the Parthenos as a model for later religious statues of Athena Polias. On the whole the general form of

²⁴ Herrington, 1955,9, makes this interesting point.

the statue by Phidias was maintained at Priene, but the sculptor did not attempt to recreate that image.

It would be more satisfying if the physical remains of the statue had been able to support this hypothesis. However, so little survives of the cult image that its appearance in the temple is hard to imagine. The most obvious aspect of the statue, from its remains, is that it was constructed as an acrolith. Fragments of the extremities survive and provide some indications for the piecing together of the image. The hands, arms and neck show a rather summary modelling of the anatomical features, which is perhaps not surprising due to its colossal size, but when compared to the excellent quality of carving of the feet it becomes more perplexing. This contrast of quality in execution of parts of the body situated high above the cella floor and those at a lower level is comparable with the Lykosoura group by Damophon, and also to some extent with the Pheneos fragments by Attalos. In both cases hands are rather crudely and simply rendered whereas feet are carefully and precisely carved. A possible reason is that the feet when positioned on their high base were at eye level whereas the hands and arms were at a level where it would have been impossible to perceive specific details. It can only be supposed that these finer details were added in paint as both the Priene and Lykosoura images preserve traces of pigment. Only two major pieces of the head of Athena are preserved, namely the lips and part of the neck, neither of which can help us stylistically. The most impressive feature of the statue would have been its use of different materials and colours, rendering the statue visually stunning. Unfortunately we can only restore the drapery through depictions of the statue on coins, where Athena is shown as wearing the simple peplos with a broad and deep overfold at the waist (fig. 127). Carter's reconstruction has the same arrangement of

drapery as the other Parthenos variations but due to its date, the style may perhaps have been more like the Parthenos from the library of Eumenes at Pergamon. This variant has the simpler drapery style of fifth century statues but the modelling of the folds are heavier and the surfaces more agitated, particularly when compared to later Roman copies of the Athenian statue.²⁵ The head has also the more rounded and sensitive carving of the facial features associated with Pergamon, particularly on the Gigantomachy. The almost contemporary variant at Priene may also have been modelled in this more animated and vibrant manner but this is uncertain. At Priene the draped parts were either of wood or genuine textiles, though it is difficult to imagine a successful draping of cloth garments over a wooden frame.

The impression given by the coins and fragments of the cult statue at Priene is one of grandeur and immense power. The size of the statue on its base reached over seven and a half metres and with the contrasting materials, colour and perhaps gilded wooden drapery, would have been visually stunning even in the gloom of the dark cella. Overall the statue would have been the most striking piece of religious statuary in the city and one of the largest and most expensive dedications of any Hellenistic cult image in Asia Minor.

The Athena Krania at Elatea

Another cult image probably carved around the middle of the second century B.C. was the Athena Krania at Elatea in Phokis. The main point of interest of this cult image is that it

²⁵ Compare the torso found on the Athenian acropolis (Acropolis Museum no.1362), probably one of the most faithful replicas of the Phidian original. See Leipen, 1971, figs.11-12.

was the work of the sculptors Timokles and Timarchides who were members of the vast family of Polykles. For the appearance of the image and its stylistic characteristics we must rely on coins from the city and also the few, unpublished fragments of the Athena which were recovered in excavations at the end of the last century. Pausanias is our only other source, briefly describing the statue in the temple at Elatea and mentioning the names of the sculptors.²⁶ Coinage from the city show the cult image depicts the goddess fully armed and in a surprisingly animated pose for a temple statue.²⁷ Athena is shown with her head in profile and her body in three quarter view. She moves towards her left with the right leg striding in front of the left. Her right arm thrusts her spear from behind whilst the left holds a shield slightly away from her body. She wears a large Corinthian helmet which allows her hair to hang loosely over her shoulders. Her garments consist of a heavy, long peplos with a broad overfold around her hips. The die cutter has indicated a simplicity in the treatment of the folds which emphasize the strong movement in a simple yet effective manner. The garment is belted high beneath the breasts, but there is no indication of the usual *aegis*. The peplos appears to follow fifth century models in its simplicity, but there is a certain heaviness about the material which indicates its Hellenistic date.

Pausanias highlights the most conspicuous feature of the composition of the Athena, namely the relief decoration carved onto her shield. He maintains that the scenes depicted were a precise imitation of those on the shield of the Parthenos by Phidias which showed an Amazonomachy. No fragments of the shield were recovered during excavations but a

²⁶ Pausanias, 9.34.8.

²⁷ For the coins see Imhoof-Blumer, 1964, plate Y, 15-16.

large portion of the cult image was found built into a Byzantine wall on the site. The largest piece preserves the lower legs from the knees downwards and also part of the plinth on which it stood. There are, however, no illustrations of this unpublished fragment in any of the accounts of this cult image.²⁸ The interest here lies in the fact that the preserved legs appear to be in a similar pose to that of the goddess on the coin, the only difference being that the marble fragment has a wider stride than the goddess on the coin. The style of the piece is only indicated by the treatment of the material hanging between the moving, lower legs. Paris describes the material in some detail and concludes that the carving is schematic and dry with deep cuttings in the marble between the pleats of material.²⁹ In the conclusion he maintains that there is a lack of sensitivity in the modelling of the peplos. A "dry" modelling style was common in the second half of the century and is particularly conspicuous on the statues of Amphitrite from Melos and Persephone from Kyzikos. This would be an easier date to justify if the two sculptors could be more accurately located within the family of Polykles. It is possible that these two sculptors were still active until approximately 146 B.C. The sculptors were descended from a long line of stone carvers and the whole family before and after them were extremely successful, if success can be determined from the number of commissions they procured.³⁰ A brief account of the careers of this family of sculptors seems a reasonable digression at this point, particularly if we are to understand the types of commissions

²⁸ I have not been able to see the original piece nor consult any photographs of the marble fragment. The statue has been commented upon by Paris, 1892; Becatti, 1940; Papachatzes, 1981; and Stewart 1979 and 1991. None of the above provide an indication of the statue's present location.

²⁹ Paris, 1892,125

³⁰ The head of the family was probably Polykles I, active around 200 B.C. and the sons of Timokles and Timarchides, Polykles II and Dionysios continued the family tradition and carved many cult images and honorary statues for Greek and Roman patrons. For a detailed analysis of the family of sculptors see Coarelli, 1969 and Stewart, 1979,42-6.

awarded to the sculptors, and thereby to determine whether there are any stylistic streams running through the generations.

The general consensus of opinion would categorize the whole family as classicising and eclectic sculptors. Herbert describes the sons of Polykles I as belonging to a classicising stream of sculptors of the first half of the second century B.C.³¹ It has, however, already been noted in previous sections how potentially confusing and inaccurate the label classicising can be. The term itself requires considerable substantiation and should only be applied to sculptors whose work was deliberately based upon Classical originals and was originally intended to be viewed as such. It is important that the family of Polykles should not be grouped together under the label of classicising, as the later members of the family were more likely to have been influenced by late Hellenistic tendencies towards eclecticism than those active in the first half of the century. The family are well documented and Pliny mentions Polykles I as one of the sculptors who revived the craft of stone carving in 156 B.C.³² This date seems too late for the career of Polykles I and a more suitable date for his two sons Timokles and Timarchides I, as Polykles was probably an aged man by this time. The sons of Polykles are assumed by most authors to be the instigators of the copying industry, mainly because the family were frequently employed by Roman patrons to create cult images for the new temples being constructed in Rome in the second century B.C.³³ A large Apollo in the temple near the Portico of Octavia was the work of Timarchides, though as Stewart points out, it is not clear whether this is the

³¹ Herbert, 1989,232, no.Q465.

³² Pliny, NH.34.52.

³³ Those who maintain this viewpoint include Dickens, Pollitt and Stewart.

older or younger holder of that name.³⁴ It is clear that the family were frequently employed to produce cult images not only for Rome but for cities in Aetolia, Macedonia and Phokis cities as shown by the two cult statues at Elateia by Timokles and Timarchides; the Asklepios and the Athena Krania. Coarelli and Becatti have both attempted to assign certain extant works to members of the family. The Cyrene Apollo has been cited as a copy of the Apollo by Timarchides in Rome, which will be discussed below, while heads of Herakles and of Juno have also been assigned to Polykles and Timarchides respectively. If we are to accept these attributions and take into account the possible eclectic nature of the Athena Kraneia and the surviving statue by Timarchides and Dionysios at Delos, then these works certainly do demonstrate a mixture of styles and a number of influences.³⁵ Returning to the Athena Krania, which has only one obvious classicising feature, the reliefs on the shield, the general composition is not based upon the statues of Athena by the great later fifth century masters. There are archaizing devices in the drapery, and the main influence for this type of Athena probably originated in the early Classical period. The Athena on the coin from Elatea has more in common with an archaizing statue of Roman date which was found at Herculaneum.³⁶ Pollitt comments upon the statue and calls it a copy of a second century B.C. original and of the Athena Promachos type.³⁷ This statue has a similar elaborate helmet with a large plume on the

³⁴ Pollitt, 1990, 161. Several versions of the family tree of the Polykles family of sculptors have been proposed and none are necessarily accurate. Because of the long period of time and the discrepancies between sculptors of the same name working in different areas and together with different partners, it is perhaps the case that even more members of the family existed. The most comprehensive genealogy is provided by Pollitt and was suggested in the early years of this century by Dickens, 1971,57.

³⁵ The statue of C.Offellius Ferus at Delos is preserved only as a headless torso, which appears to have been modelled on a Praxitelean statue according to Pollitt, 1986,75. The modelling of the anatomical features, however, still retains hints of the baroque. The handling of the flesh surfaces is quite vigorous and the pose is frequently used for male heroic portraits, as is the drapery over the shoulder. The statue shows a quiet style but not wholly eclectic.

³⁶ For this statue see Fullerton, 1990, plate 16.

³⁷ Pollitt, 1986,75.

crest and she throws back her right arm to thrust the spear. The right arm is in a corresponding position, but instead of holding a shield, she stretches her aegis in a fan-shaped arrangement. The stride of her legs is slightly wider than the Athena on the Elateian coin, but similar to the marble fragment. The Athena Krania appears archaizing in style, with the treatment of the drapery around her legs suggesting that the sculptor intentionally created an image that would appear older in date. In this respect the term archaizing is used in an appropriate manner. That the shield was copied from the Parthenos by Phidias was another device to re-create an older type of statue and also probably alluded to the political function of the Athenian statue.

It is difficult to determine, however, why the Elateians wanted an image of Athena which appeared older in date, a concept that has arisen in other examples of Athena's cult image. To propose a reasonable answer to this puzzle and to provide a closer dating of the work of Timokles and Timarchides at Elateia we must search for the motives behind the dedication of a temple and statue to the goddess in the second century. When Pausanias describes the city of Elateia he stresses the misfortunes experienced by its citizens and its monuments.³⁸ One particular catastrophe that the city suffered was that shortly after 200 B.C. the inhabitants of the city were forced to leave, either by Roman or Aetolian forces. The Elateian citizens found refuge in the Arkadian city of Stymphalos, which had legendary connections with the Phokian city. In 191 the Roman consul Acilius granted the Elateians an opportunity to return to their city.³⁹ It might be expected that on their return the people of Elateia would have tried to re-assert their local identity and to re-

³⁸ Pausanias, 10.34.2.

³⁹ For historical information on Elateia see Habicht, 1985,67-68.

establish a feeling of civic pride. Therefore, once the city had re-established itself politically and economically, this sense of renewed pride might be expected to manifest itself in architecture or the re-furbishment of sanctuaries. Therefore, a possible date for the embellishment of the sanctuaries of both Asklepios and Athena, would be somewhere in the decades following the Elateians' return. The sons of Polykles were probably active around the middle decades of the second century B.C. and we would expect the cult image to be one of the last elements of the temple to be completed. The dates, therefore, coincide quite well, but there is no evidence to support this theory.

In conclusion the statue of Athena Krania could have been erected to assert renewed civic pride some time in the middle of the second century, but a closer dating is not possible. The sculptors Timokles and Timarchides created an effective statue using earlier models for their inspiration and adding a well known design on the shield to emphasize, perhaps, the city aspect of the goddess; Athena in her role as patron of and warrior defender of the people, and protectress of wisdom. The slightly more animated pose is unusual and in its original position in the temple it would have had no striking viewpoint. The base measures 2.00 metres square and is positioned in the centre of the west end of the cella wall, but does not abutt it. The statue could also be viewed from the sides, though from the doorway Athena's head would have been seen in profile. There was no eye contact with the worshippers but access to different viewing angles was not restricted. The whole design is uncommon for temple statues, but for a warlike Athena, crowned with a helmet and functioning as the patron deity of a city, the type of statue used is perhaps not surprising. Restored to its original height of approximately 3.00 - 3.50 metres it would have been an imposing cult image and its derivative nature and antiquated appearance

would have been served as a symbol of the city's recent history, and could have demonstrated a prolonged promotion of the cult of Athena.⁴⁰

For the remainder of the second century B.C. there are no recorded cult images of Athena. There are fragments of a statue of Athena, on a comparable scale to the Athena Polias at Priene, at Notion near Kolophon in Ionia. This statue and its temple were once considered Hellenistic, but now the general consensus favours a Roman date.⁴¹ For other temples only that at Herakleia in Latmos is certainly Athena's, but no trace or evidence for the cult image survives. Finally one head of Athena merits a brief comment, that associated with Euboulides and found near the Dipylon gate in Athens. This large scale head is thought by some scholars to have originally been part of a group by the later second century sculptor Euboulides, consisting of Apollo, Athena, Zeus, Mnemosyne and the Muses. The relationship, however, between Euboulides and the monument has recently been challenged, and the head of Athena is no longer thought to be the work of that sculptor.⁴² The head is still interesting as it reveals the most derivative of styles for the second century B.C., being based upon fifth century originals, of which the Velletri Athena and the Guistiniani Athena are later copies.⁴³ The Dipylon Athena, therefore seems to date to the mid to late second century B.C.

⁴⁰ The approximate height depends upon the width of stride of the lower legs. The fragment is 1.00 metre in height.

⁴¹ Leipen, 1971,7, dates the statue to the Hellenistic or Roman period, but Akurgal,1987,439, dates the temple and image to the Hadrianic period. . All that is preserved of the statue are fragments of shoulder, chest, lower legs, left flank and parts of the left arm. The statue was entirely carved out of marble. For the remains of the marble cult image see Demangel and Laumonie, 1925,322.

⁴² Smith, 1991, 240 suggests this.

⁴³ Becatti, 1940,52.

On the whole statues of the goddess from this period tend to be derivative. New Hellenistic cities preferred to have eclectic creations in their temples rather than to depict Athena in contemporary styles. The motivation behind this must surely have been political, in an attempt to falsify the antiquity of the cult and to promote the city's political power. As the goddess had symbolised the values of the Classical city states, so her images in the Hellenistic period try to recapture some of this grandeur. As a result, the iconography of the goddess became rather conservative when compared to other Olympian deities. The Parthenos by Phidias was the basis for later cult images of the goddess, but its characteristics were not followed meticulously, as new sanctuaries preferred a more ancient archaic model.

For the god Hermes there is scarcely any evidence of his Hellenistic cult images. In terms of other sculpture he is also poorly represented amongst original works and there are few later copies that can be associated with any prototypes of this period. Yet the lack of cult images should not be considered surprising as Hermes had few Classical temples, but was a popular subject in the minor arts in vase painting, in small scale sculpture and bronzes. There were of course important Archaic and Classical cult statues and he was a popular choice for sculptors in marble and bronze large scale sculpture. His association with athletics generated many images of the god in gymnasia and his connection with commerce caused statues of him to be set up in market places.

During the Hellenistic period the god's popularity did not wane and in the minor arts he was still a popular deity. As outlined in the section on Aphrodite, Damophon produced a group of that goddess in her temple at Megalopolis, accompanied by a marble statue of Hermes. This group combined an acrolithic and a stone statue, but is not obvious amongst cult images reproduced on coins from the city, so little more can be said. Apart from this cult image of the god and the later one at Pheneos, there is no other evidence for temples of Hermes on mainland Greece. The islands are equally lacking evidence for the cult of the god in terms of temples and cult images.

Even more surprising is the shortage of temples in the Hellenistic cities of Asia Minor. Only at Pergamon is a shrine attributed to Hermes and this he shared with Herakles, in the middle gymnasium. This was built during the second half of the second century B.C., but

no trace of the cult images survive.¹ Other cities probably contained shrines for the god, perhaps of modest size and in similar locations but little is known about them. Probably built at about the same time as the Pergamene temple was a temple at Pheneos in northern Arkadia. Pausanias is our only source about the shrine of Hermes there and he tells us that the god was worshipped above all others in the city.² The Pheneans had inaugurated an athletic festival to the god known as the Hermaia which was still held during the time of Pausanias' visit. The writer tells us that the statue was of marble and the work of the sculptor Eucheiros, who was probably a member of the Athenian family of sculptors, known best in the literary texts by the sculptor Euboulides. Pollitt and Stewart date the family of sculptors to the latter half of the second century, but most scholars label them as classicising in style. This stylistic classification is mainly due to the fragments of a group in Athens comprising Zeus, Athena, Mnemosyne, Apollo and the Muses, of which the head of the former figure survives.³ Eucheiros was also involved in the carving of this group; his name is preserved in the dedicatory inscription.⁴ As mentioned in the section * about Athena, the head of Athena has been recently dissociated from the sculptors and if this is correct, then the classicising label must be removed.

To return to the Hermes, the only evidence other than that of Pausanias is a coin from Pheneos which shows a standing figure of the god which may reproduce the cult statue. As the principal deity of the city, we may reasonably expect his most famous cult image there to be used on coinage but of course these provide only limited information. The

¹ See Akurgal, 1987,445.

² Pausanias, 8.14.10.

³ See section on Athena by Euboulides (?).

⁴ See Pollitt, 1986,165.

coins show the god standing with the weight on his right leg and the left relaxed, holding a caduceus in his raised left hand and a wallet of some sort in his lowered right one. He appears to be naked and most coins show him with a rather large head in proportion to his body. Nothing more can be gleaned from the coinage about the image, least of all the style of Eucheiros, and so the matter must await further excavation in the city. The site was of course where Attalos produced the acrolithic images in the Asklepieion, mentioned in the relevant section, which are of about the same date.

So Hermes is poorly represented amongst original Hellenistic works and temples are lacking. Furthermore, the god shared two of his three Hellenistic temples with other deities: with Herakles as patrons of athletes and with Aphrodite, who is usually associated with the god in a sexual role, as the divine parents of Hermaphrodite where the cult of Aphrodite Manchantis, the Contriver would suit either a sexual function or perhaps had a chthonic character. All this is pure speculation, but this is all we possess for the cult images of Hermes.

TABLE 1

DATE	PLACE	CULT STATUE(S)	SCULPTOR	COINAGE
325 - 300	Megalopolis	Zeus Soter	Kephisodotos	*
325 - 300	Dion	Demeter and Kore		
325 - 300	Corinth	Asklepios and Hygieia		*
305 - 302	Delos	Aphrodite Ourania		
About 300	Delos	Demeter and Kore		
300 - 281	Daphne	Apollo Pytheios	Bryaxis	*
300 - 275	Kallipolis	Demeter and Kore		
300 - 275	Kos, Temple B	Asklepios and Hygieia		*
278 - 265	Tenos	Poseidon and Amphitrite	Telesimos	*
281 - 241	Pergamon	Demeter		
290 - 250	Pergamon	Athena Polias		*
281 ?	Sardis	Artemis		* ?
265 - 260	Nikomedia	Zeus Stratios	Doidalos	*
About 250	Melos	Asklepios		
225 - 200	Pergamon	Asklepios	Phyromachos	*
225 - 200	Sardis	Zeus Lydios		
221 - 200	Mng.on Maender	Artemis Leukophyrene		*
220 - 200	Klaros	Apollo, Artemis, Leto		*

DATE	PLACE	CULT STATUE(S)	SCULPTOR	COINAGE
204 - 200	Tenos	Dionysos Setairios		*
220 - 190	Aegion	Asklepios and Hygieia	Damophon	*
220 - 190	Megalopolis	Demeter and Kore	Damophon	
220 - 190	Megalopolis	Aphrodite and Hermes	Damophon	
220 - 190	Lykosoura	Despoina, Demeter, Artemis, Antyos	Damophon	*
220 - 190	Massene	Asklepios and family	Damophon	*
220 - 190	Massene	Apollo and the Muses	Damophon	
220 - 190	Massene	Artemis Phosphoros	Damophon	
220 - 190	Massene	Artemis Laphria	Damophon	*
About 200	Rhodes	Aphrodite		
About 195	Mng.on Maender	Zeus Sosipolis		*
200 - 150	Dion	Aphrodite Hypolympida		
190 - 160	Mounychia	Asklepios		
190 - 160	Pergamon, "R"	Asklepios		* ?
190 - 160	Massene	Artemis Orthia ?		
About 180	Gortyna	Apollo Pytheios		
175 - 150	Knosos	Kore		
160 - 150	Pergamon	Hera Basileia and Zeus		

DATE	PLACE	CULT STATUE(S)	SCULPTOR	COINAGE
About 160	Kos, temple A	Asklepios and Hygieia		*
158/7	Prisne	Athena Polias		*
About 150	Melos	Poseidon and Amphitrite		
About 150	Aegira	Dionysos		
189 - 140	Elataia	Asklepios	Timokles and Timarchides	
180 - 140	Elataia	Athena Kraneia	Timokles and Timarchides	*
150 - 125	Angira	Zeus	Eukleides	*
150 - 125	Bouna	Demeter	Eukleides	*
150 - 125	Bouna	Dionysos	Eukleides	
150 - 125	Bouna	Aphrodite	Eukleides	
150 - 125	Angira	Asklepios and Hygieia	Xenophilos and Stratos	*
150 - 125	Phigaleia	Asklepios and Hygieia	Attalos	
150 - 125	Angira	Apollo	Attalos	
150 - 125	Phigaleia	Hermes	Eucheiros	*
150/140	Elataia	Zeus and Athena		

EPIGRAPHIC	LITERARY	PATRON	MATERIAL	DIMENSIONS
	Pausanias		Marble ?	
			Marble	Life-size
	Pausanias			
*		Stesileos - archon	Gilded marble	
*			Acrolithic	
	Libanios	Seleukos I	Acrolithic	Colossal
			Marble	Over life-size
*			Acrolithic	4.00 + 3.60 metres
		Philetairos	Marble ?	Life-size
		Philetairos		
		Seleukos I		
*		Nikomedes I		
			Marble	3.50 metres, standing
*		Attalos I		
		Achaeos	Acrolithic ?	9-10 metres, seated
		Antiochos III and IV	Marble	Apollo = 7.50 metres seated

EPIGRAPHIC	LITERARY	PATRON	MATERIAL	DIMENSIONS
		Antiochos III		
*			Pentelic marble	
*			Acrolithic and marble	4 - 5 metres seated
*			Acrolithic and marble	
*			Marble	Seated = 4.60, standing = 3.70
*			Marble ?	
*			Marble ?	Apollo = just over life-size
*			Marble ?	
			Marble ?	
			Marble	1.94 metres standing
			Marble	3.00 metres seated
*		Anthesias loukoundas	Marble	Unknown
			Marble	2.50 metres standing
		Eumenes II	Marble	3.00 metres seated
			Marble	Unknown
			Acrolithic	2.80 metres standing
			Marble	1.15 metres, headless
		Attalos II	Marble	Zeus = 2.21 metres headless

EPIGRAPHIC	LITERARY	PATRON	MATERIAL	DIMENSIONS
*		Orophernes	Acrolithic	6.69 metres standing
			Marble	2.48 + 1.92 (headless) metres
			Acrolithic	4.50 metres seated
*			Marble	3.00 metres standing
*			Marble	
*			Marble	
*			Marble	
*			Marble	
*			Acrolithic	Hygieia - 4.50 metres standing
*				
*		Dionysios - archon	Acrolithic/marble ?	Colossal

Conclusion

To conclude such a study satisfactorily is not an easy task. The wider issues can, however, be addressed, particularly the question of how important the iconography of the Olympian deities was to the Hellenistic sculptor. What is evident is the amount of material confronted during the course of the research. Surviving sculptures representing the Olympian gods, either as individual statues or groups or reliefs are abundant in this period. The Olympians retained their hold in the sculptor's repertoire in addition to the increased number of portraits, genre, mythological and "heroic" themes. In fact, the quantity of sculpture produced must have been enormous, particularly as Greek culture expanded eastwards into new territories. The number of temples constructed during this period is also large, though they are little known compared to their Archaic and Classical predecessors. Admittedly sculpture on temples began to decrease in prominence; for example, few pedimental groups or metopes survive from such buildings. However, the altar had always been the primary location for ritual practices, examples of which become larger and much grander in Hellenistic times. There is a definite move towards decorating the altar with sculpture rather than the temple itself. This is seen most clearly at Priene, Magnesia on the Maeander and obviously at Pergamon. This increase in size and elaboration of altars is a topic within itself and cannot be discussed in depth here. Yet this poses an interesting question, whether cult images were the main focus of funds for sculpture. If cult statues were the primary call on sanctuary funds then we may perhaps expect them to have been manufactured out of precious materials and have been produced by the finest sculptors. There are few inscriptions recording the costs of cult images during the Hellenistic period and the surviving examples, in their fragmentary state, do not

reveal to us today any costly additions such as gilding. One surprising feature is the lack of chryselephantine cult statues, which has prompted some scholars to propose that acrolithic statues rose into prominence as a cheaper imitation of the gold and ivory images. This will be dealt with in more detail shortly.

To return to the actual fragments of cult images and the range of deities portrayed, only those sculptures which are definitely or possibly cult images have been analysed in any depth and statues which served other functions have been intentionally omitted or briefly referred to when good comparisons could be drawn. Naturally, those cult statues which have fixed contexts have been analysed in more detail, if they are published. Other, but no less interesting pieces, such as the cult images from Dion and Kallipolis must await more detailed study before they can be thoroughly understood. For deities where the original evidence has been thin, which was certainly the case for Poseidon, Dionysos, Aphrodite and Athena, much more use was made of possible cult image fragments, copies, or numismatic and literary evidence. Such an approach was necessary in order to locate popular types for deities whose cult was as significant as that of other Olympians but whose surviving temple statues are rare. Some controversial issues concerning identification of images either of actual fragments, such as the Sardis and Pergamene fragments of Zeus or the Demeter from the same city or the Dionysos from Aegira, will be the subject of debate for many years to come. Several of the fragments which have been labelled Roman in date, such as the Trojan Zeus, the Klaros group and the Kyzikos Kore have been positively located within the Hellenistic period through comparison with more securely dated pieces. Most of the fragments, however, can only be loosely dated

within the period, again using stylistic parallels. Coins and literary evidence play a major role but can only give us a brief glimpse into the appearance of a cult image.

The narrower issue is that of the Hellenistic cult image. Its appearance, the sculptors involved, the techniques used and the financing of temple statues. The chronology of Hellenistic cult images can be loosely determined and is best recorded in a tabulated form (Table 1). This shows the range of sources used to reconstruct the evidence for cult images of the period. An asterisk indicates that evidence survives for that particular category. Only those Hellenistic cult images which are attested in some form or another are registered in the table. It can not of course include those fragments which may have possibly served as temple statues but have no fixed context or provenance nor any copies but otherwise covers the range of evidence in a compact form.

A natural conclusion to such a study can perhaps be divided up into two sections; the cult images themselves and the sculptors and patrons of the statues. The first section brings together the techniques and materials used by the sculptors, the scale and display of these cult statues, decoration, types and style. The second deals with the sculptors themselves, their contracts, and the cities or individuals who commissioned and paid for the statues.

Section A - The cult images

The surviving evidence itself can enable us to draw definite conclusions regarding the technical aspects of Hellenistic cult images. The analysis of each particular image or group has already highlighted any ancillary decoration used to complete the cult picture.

The types and styles presented through the surviving pieces have also been investigated above, but here we can demonstrate their variety and suggest any particular fashions of the Hellenistic period. One important issue is the scale and display of the cult images and their relationship with the temples in which they stood.

Scale and display

Scale was an important factor in the appearance of cult images. Often housed within small shrines, many of the surviving sculptures are on a large or even a colossal scale. The chart shows that between 325 and 100 B.C. there are no obvious patterns that would indicate changes in preference in the scale of cult images. It has been proposed earlier that Lysippos may have re-popularised colossal sculpture in the later fourth century, and so we might expect subsequent cult statues to have followed his precedent. Unfortunately those massive temples which were begun in the third century have yielded little evidence of the cult images they contained. At Sardis the Artemis temple probably contained a colossal image of the goddess and certainly housed a sizeable image of Zeus, between 9 - 10 meters high depending on whether it was seated or standing. The Daphne Apollo by Bryaxis was as large as the seated Zeus at Olympia, about 13 metres high, making it the largest of all recorded or surviving Hellenistic cult images. The Dionysos from Athens is an early Hellenistic, possible cult image fragment on a colossal scale but from an unknown setting. At Tenos, Telesinos assembled sizeable though not immense images of Poseidon and Amphitrite. We know little about the scale of the Zeus Stratiotes at Bithynia or the cult images installed in the third century temples at Pergamon, of which Athena's temple was the largest. Teos and Magnesia on the Maeander have also provided no

evidence of the scale of their cult statues, but again are sizeable temples. Klaros is more revealing and the group is colossal in scale. On the whole the temples constructed, or at least begun, during the third century B.C. are large in comparison with their second century counterparts from which more cult images survive.

Towards the end of the third century and into the second, Damophon was creating colossal images in the Peloponnese. These were relatively smaller in scale than the earlier examples, but the temples in which they were housed are either unknown in the archaeological record or small in scale, as at Lykosoura or the shrines at Messene. Other surviving second century cult statues tend to be between one and two thirds to twice life-size, the exception being the Athena from Priene. Also from the middle of the century come the Dionysos at Aegira and the Pheneos group, which are of considerable size, but neither dedicated in a large temple. In general, the largest surviving cult statues were acrolithic, a technique more suited for such colossal statuary.

Those sculptures included as possible cult images tend to be larger than life-size, a criterion admittedly used in their initial selection. Yet that not all cult images were large in scale is shown by the Demeter from Dion and the Knossos Kore, so a large scale must not be assumed to be a fair indication that a sculpture served a ritual purpose.

Unfortunately there are few surviving Classical cult statues to compare in terms of scale, so it is not possible to determine whether Hellenistic examples tended to be larger in size.

The technique used seems on the whole determined by the scale of the piece, yet the Klaros cult images show that statues made entirely of marble could also be colossal in scale.

The setting in which the cult images stood was possibly also an important determining factor of the appearance of the image. Owing to the way they were built, Greek temples were probably gloomy places. They did not usually have windows and often had only one door and therefore the light source would have been limited to such openings and to torchlight. Furthermore, once in the temple most cult statues would have only been visible from the front and perhaps the sides. Such fine details as the embroidered drapery on Damophon's Despoina or the Tralleis Apollo would have needed to be highlighted in paint in order to be visible. We must think though that this darkness would have been an important element in creating the right kind of atmosphere for viewing such sacred images.

The archaeological and literary record is inexplicit about how cult statues were displayed or how worshippers viewed the statues. Pausanias makes an important observation at Olympia when discussing the Zeus by Phidias.¹ The temple had an upper gallery, reached by a spiral staircase, from which visitors could behold the face of the god. Such an upper gallery was perhaps only possible in Doric temples with an inner two-tier colonnade as at Olympia or the temple of Aphaia on Aegina. In the Hellenistic period, if the Ionic order was used, no such colonnade could have existed, while the Doric temples constructed, with the exception of Athena's at Pergamon and the temple at Klaros, were too small to have such an architectural arrangement. In fact the interior arrangement in some of the larger Ionic temples of the Hellenistic period may have effectively narrowed the angles of viewing the cult image down, rather than encouraged easy vision. At Magnesia on the Maeander and Sardis the cult images were contained within, and framed by, a row of

¹ Pausanias, 5.10.10.

columns. In the smaller temples we often find that the cult statue bases fill the entire width of the cella. At Kallipolis, the temple of Zeus at Priene, Lykosoura, several of the temples at Pergamon, Kos and Pheneos the groups would have filled the small shrines completely. The only cult image in this investigation to have been displayed in a niche is the Aphrodite at Dion, but this was really a shrine within a larger architectural complex.

The visual impact of most of the cult images, whether life-size or colossal, would of course have been intensified by their position on high bases. These do not always survive and when they do, rarely preserve their original height; but they would have raised the statues above the worshipper and created a sense of awe. Curtains and screens may also have increased the sense of mystery as one entered a temple to view the cult image; but no tangible evidence survives for these in any of the temples from which Hellenistic cult images survive. The only other rewarding evidence for such devices is again provided by Pausanias with reference to the temple of Despoina at Lykosoura. There he mentions a mirror on the wall as you left the temple in which you could only dimly see your own reflection but could see the two goddesses and their throne clearly.² This mirror, as far as we know, is unique but it must have had an important function in the rituals at the Mystery sanctuary. In general, however, we are at a loss to reconstruct the temple settings of the cult images. What we can, however, determine from the surviving cult images are the techniques and materials favoured by the sculptors and patrons.

² Pausanias, 8.37.7.

Technique, material and decoration

The oldest cult images were often made of wood, the so-called xoana, or sometimes roughly shaped pieces of stone. At various periods throughout Greek history these needed to be replaced, or at least, as temples grew larger in scale, new cult images, more suited to the space provided, were dedicated. Such cult images were often made of other materials and few are known to have been made entirely of wood, though there are exceptions. During the Hellenistic period the range of materials remains the same but there are interesting examples where different media are utilised, either for effect or possibly due to certain religious considerations. A glance at the chart reveals that bronze was not used for those Hellenistic cult images for which some evidence survives, though this material was widely used for other forms of sculpture. Chryselephantine cult statues are also almost non-existent: this does not necessarily indicate that revenue was lacking for cult statues but may rather indicate a change in fashion. Even some of the largest temples in the wealthier cities of Asia Minor and dynastic capital cities have not provided evidence for ivory and gold cult statues. Gold, however, seems to have been frequently used to decorate acrolithic or marble statues, which indicates that funds were not wanting during the period. Chryselephantine statues may have been used in some of the major temples of the period, for instance at Magnesia on the Maeander, at Sardis and Teos and other large temples. At Aegira the Zeus by Eukleides, known only from coins, stood beside a gold and ivory statue of Athena with her wooden drapery covered with gold leaf and paint, possibly Hellenistic in date. This mixing of materials is typically Hellenistic and can be testified throughout the catalogue of cult images but the technique most prominent in the larger temples of the period is the acrolithic mode of construction.

From the larger temples of the period survives the fragment of the cult image of Zeus at Sardis which was possibly acrolithic. The Artemis in the other cella of the same temple may also have been constructed in this manner; a technique appropriate to the scale of the building. Much has been said about this technique, mainly by those scholars who see a revival in acrolithic cult images during the second century B.C. as part of a classicising trend. Yet the few examples made in this way span the whole of the period and do not show any obvious signs of imitating Classical prototypes. Madigan, in his analysis of the acrolith from Aegira, claims that some cult statues in the Peloponnese were made this way as the result of strict specifications by the patrons.³ He further asserts that cities in this region were particularly conservative in their religious practices but submits no reasons to support such a remark. He cites only a few examples of such cult statues, which he claims are replacements for lost statues in temples of an earlier date. Two examples, the Dionysos from Aegira and the Pheneos groups, appear to post date their temples considerably; he suggests this is because they were replacements and the patron demanded that they were made in this so-called conservative and Classical technique. It is certainly true that in these two instances they may have been dedicated to replace lost statues, but as already stated the acrolithic technique was not an out dated mode of construction, but was already popular in the late Classical and early Hellenistic periods also. Madigan's other examples, both by Damophon, are the cult images of Kore and Aphrodite at Megalopolis which possibly post-date the temples in which they stood. The thorough destruction of the city in 223 B.C. may have necessitated the rebuilding of these shrines and the replacement of the cult statues. Not enough is known, however, about the sanctuary to be certain of the date of its construction or possible rebuilding. Leaving

³ Madigan, 1993, 116.

religious considerations behind, at the above sanctuaries the acrolithic technique was perhaps utilised as a result of the desired scale of the cult images rather than in emulation of earlier cult statues made of different materials. Furthermore, even if the technique was intended to evoke a sense of age it does not necessarily follow that the style was also retrospective. We need to look for other motives behind the popularity of the technique for cult statues.

The desire to economise may have encouraged the production of acrolithic statues in the Hellenistic period: if wood was used at the expense of marble then the image would have cost less. There will also have been cases where marble was in short supply: the relative abundance of acrolithic fragments in Sicily and southern Italy from the Archaic and Classical periods is perhaps best explained in this way. The Peloponnese, however, was not far from the marble quarries of Mount Pentelikos so lack of marble cannot have explained this extensive use of wood. Furthermore this area had a tradition of carving in marble. Hellenistic acroliths may have been heavily gilded which would not have been cheap and other precious materials possibly used to inlay the eyes again do not indicate a decrease in the cost of cult images. We should imagine also that the larger temples of the day may have used ivory and more gold leaf to decorate any wooden or even marble parts. The Aphrodite at Delos for instance had a gilded cup and earrings. Moreover, the manpower required to build these sculptures must have been great, yet another argument against this technique being employed to reduce the costs. The technique was used in many of the preserved images and recorded statues but is often difficult to identify if only a head survives. It must be remembered that the acrolithic technique was a convenient way of constructing colossal statues, whereby the sculptor could alleviate the problem of

excessive weight on the floor of a cella. Tradition may also have been in the minds of those who commissioned the cult statues. Yet if this was a major consideration, we should perhaps expect more chryselephantine statues, modelled on Phidias' Athena and Zeus. An interesting comparison between Hellenistic and earlier acroliths is that the latter tended to be constructed out of many separately made pieces. Surviving heads usually take the form of hairless, mask-like heads, or often just faces of marble. These are perhaps the imitators of the chryselephantine technique which had ivory faces, hands and feet and probably wooden or bronze hair and other details. Hellenistic examples, on the other hand, are usually fully modelled heads, sometimes constructed in two halves, front and back, as at Pheneos or Aegira. The only obvious exception is the Aphrodite at Megalopolis by Damophon where the only marble parts were the face, feet and hands; this then could have been inspired by a chryselephantine cult image.

The most satisfactory conclusion is that the acrolithic technique satisfied both the desires of the patron and the fashion of the day as well as being sometimes used when a large scale was required. Acroliths ought not to be viewed as a cheaper versions of chryselephantine statues, but rather were chosen for a variety of reasons. This was a popular and arbitrarily used technique.

Another important technique common during the Hellenistic period was the piecing together of marble statues from many separately carved pieces. This is a convenient point to bring in those sculptures which have been tentatively labelled cult images. All of them are marble but still provide useful information in terms of technique, in that they reveal how marble continued to be one of the major materials from which cult images were

produced. None of them, apart from perhaps the head of Dionysos in Athens, appear to be fragments from acrolithic sculptures. By far the majority of preserved cult images were carved in marble, then adorned with other materials, paint and precious stones for inlaid eyes. Many of them were pieced together with the joins becoming perhaps more obvious in the surviving fragments of the mid second century B.C. than earlier examples. Of course paint may have concealed the joins in the Zeus from Pergamon, the Melos group and the Dion Aphrodite which appear in more conspicuous positions than on earlier figures. This piecing, again considered by some as a method of alleviating waste and therefore saving money, was again suitable for constructing colossal statuary. The metal dowels used to join the separate pieces would have enabled the sculptor to dispense with unsightly struts to support outstretched arms or free-hanging pieces of drapery. These dowels would have strengthened weak points in the image, hence the lack of evidence for struts. On figures such as the Askelpios from Mounychia, with his exaggerated *contrapposto*, such piecing would have helped to stabilise the statue. This is not to say that no pieced free-standing images had supports but they tend to be on the base, like the dolphin support of the Poseidon from Melos, which would have helped to strengthen the figure's bare legs. The female figures would not have required such substantial supports as their lower bodies were often heavily draped and conical in form, and this in itself would have balanced the figures. When more is known about colossal marble figures such as the Klaros group, then we may perhaps understand more about the benefits of piecing sculptures together.

Another noticeable feature of many Hellenistic cult statues is that the rear parts are often only summarily worked and rather flat. This is prominent on the Poseidon from Melos,

the Asklepios from Mounychia, the Zeus from Pergamon, the Zeus from Magnesia on the Maeander, the Aphrodite from Dion and the head of Apollo from Gortyn. Stewart claimed, in his analysis of the date of the Mounychia cult image, that this cursory treatment of the backs of cult images would not have been possible before the Hellenistic period.⁴ He proposes that Classical sculptors would have taken more care over parts that were not visible to the spectator when the statue was placed against a wall. However, few Classical cult statues are known, and those that do survive, such as the Apollo Patroos from Athens and the Demeter from Knidos, are not worked in detail at the rear. In fact the latter is not worked at all and hollowed out at the back. We can not view this as a decline in sculptor's standards but rather a sensible method of carving images which would not be seen from behind. The colossal marble groups and figures, for example the Klaros and Lykosoura groups and the acrolithic cult images, were often only carved in the semi-round with little attention to detail at the sides of the figures. Hair was often carved fully at the front with a more cursory treatment at the sides. What must not be forgotten, however, is that several of these heads had additional locks of hair which were originally attached but are now lost, as on the Aegira Dionysos, the Poseidon from Melos and Damophon's Antyos. Paint would also have completed uncarved details but the only examples of pigment remaining on any of these Hellenistic cult images are found at Lykosoura.

Additional decoration often took the form of bronze attachments. These would have further decorated marble parts and concealed what we view as neglected today in their battered and fragmentary state. The head of Asklepios from Melos still retains traces of

⁴ Stewart, 1979,49.

the metal attachments for a wreath which would have contrasted effectively with the heavily undercut locks of hair. Such metal wreaths, which were originally perhaps gilded, would have added another texture and material to the marble painted image, producing a rather striking effect. Metal wreaths were a popular addition to marble sculptures, the Apollo from Messene and the Gortyn Apollo both showing signs that these were added. On the latter sculpture, the holes for the wreath are still visible while on the latter it may have rested on the marble ridge worked around the head. Damophon's group at Lykosoura may also have been fitted with metal wreaths or crowns as well as the Poseidon from Melos and the Aegira Dionysos. At Pheneos, Attalos created a startling image of Hygieia, which shows us what other acrolithic cult images have lost. The bronze eyelashes and preserved inlaid eyes provide us with our finest example of this mixing of materials. The precious stones or coloured pastes used to create realistic eyes show the combination of materials used to complete cult images and render them more lifelike in form.

This way of combining different materials to produce cult images was popular in the Hellenistic period. Damophon was particularly masterful and imaginative in fashioning the gods in many different materials; he both utilised the acrolithic technique and was proficient in piecing together colossal marble images as well as in mastering minute, decorative detail. He also created cult images entirely of wood such as the Hermes at Megalopolis and of marble alone at Messene. At Megalopolis the Demeter was made entirely of stone, but the Kore was acrolithic. In the same shrine were his Aphrodite and Hermes, the former acrolithic, the latter entirely of wood.

Types

The catalogue of surviving cult images, possible fragments and copies shows such a diversity of types that it is difficult to isolate many common characteristics or classify a specific number of types. The combined evidence of the surviving cult images, representations on coinage and literary descriptions reveals that no two statues were alike. Few of them copy each other but some show similar characteristics. The Zeus from Pergamon, for example, may have inspired the original on which the Zeus from Smyrna was based, or may indeed be its direct prototype. This dignified and powerful image is echoed in the Poseidon from Melos and in figures of gods, heroes and mortals shown in relief sculpture. As noted in the section on the Poseidon from Tenos, the semi-draped standing type for older male deities is prominent in the early Hellenistic period. We cannot, however, consider the Poseidon by Telesinos as the prototype, but it certainly influenced the statue of the god from Melos. Nothing is new about a standing god with an himation wrapped around his lower body, raising an arm and holding sceptre or trident, but each of the Hellenistic examples is carved in a distinct manner and retains its own identity. For cult images of the older Olympian males either the enthroned or standing, semi-draped type was popular throughout the Hellenistic period. Apollo and Dionysos merge in their iconography, but cult images of Apollo tend to reflect his role as leader of the Muses and for Dionysos the evidence is too scarce for us to make any assumptions. It seems likely that the two gods do become slightly more effeminate, as suggested in the Tralleis/Cyrene type. Yet Apollo is often shown fully clothed as at Daphne and Gortyn and the two colossal images from Athens of Dionysos also reveal that this deity was often heavily draped in his cult images. Entirely naked male deities are unknown from the

surviving fragments and only Hermes was possibly depicted in this way, as the champion of the athletic ideal.

The range of female cult images seems more varied. Seated types are rare and tend to be restricted to images of Demeter and Kore and perhaps also to the Hera at Pergamon. Other goddesses are generally shown standing. Aphrodite may be entirely naked, semi draped or fully clothed. Artemis is usually shown in hunting attire, with a short tunic and quiver, often in an active pose. Perhaps the most common female type, however, is the quietly standing goddess with high girdled chiton and himation swathed around the hips and lower body. This type appears on coinage as well as in the surviving fragments. Few of the goddesses wear the cumbersome garments favoured by the mortal women of the day in their portraits. The Leto from Klaros and the Capitoline Hera are the obvious exceptions here. Athena is the only goddess who retains her usual Classical attire of a peplos. This goddess is often shown in a rather Archaic manner, stiffly posed and wearing garments arranged in an archaising way. Another popular type, usually reserved for Artemis, was the Anatolian style cult statue. This blended the Oriental and Greek goddesses into one unusual image, often with a bias towards the former, more ancient image rather than the Classical latter one. For other goddesses, who were assimilated with Olympian deities, such as Despoina, the Hellenistic cult statues tended to be more Greek in form, but ancillary decoration stressed the more ancient aspects of the rituals performed in the cult.

Groups tend to be comprised of either one standing and one seated figure, or of two standing. Rarely do both figures sit, although at Lykosoura the two enthroned goddesses

are flanked by standing images. The confined space available within a cella meant that sculptors could not experiment with postures and poses as they could with other free-standing images. Standing against cella walls, most cult images would become almost two dimensional, even when carved in the round. This impression would be intensified by the lack of viewing angles provided for the spectator. These architectural restrictions did not, however, inhibit the sculptor's imagination in terms of execution or modelling of the figures.

Style

The Hellenistic period is generally viewed as a time when several streams of sculptural style co-existed with certain geographical regions producing the most numerous examples of a particular style. Pergamon, for instance is renowned for its dynamic, so-called "Baroque" works but also, by some scholars, for its classicising sculptures. Athens is generally considered to be the place where portraiture developed most prominently. In Rhodes and the eastern Aegean islands, where most of the surviving sculpture is late Hellenistic in date, drapery is thought to have been an important element in stylistic design. The Peloponnese is considered conservative and traditional in its style of statues. These classifications, however, are rather over simplistic. In fact, from each of these regions there survive sculptures displaying many different styles. This makes the dating of sculpture rather difficult, so that chronology has taken second place to the study of different themes and types of images. The analysis of cult images, their styles and possible dates, indicates, however, that we should perhaps search harder for, if not a chronological development of style in general, at least the origin and development of the

different strands. The study of the different deities has shown that the styles outlined above are not entirely restricted to particular regions and also that sculptors travelled widely and were influenced by many factors.

Early Hellenistic cult images, that is those ranging between about 330 to 260 B.C., are rather quiet in style. The modelling of the drapery, anatomy and facial features is usually restrained, not conservative or dull, but often reflecting the styles of late Classical sculptures. The Demeter from Dion illustrates this well with her rather eclectic character which blends Phidian frontality with a slightly more sensitive fourth-century facial expression. The Kore from Kallipolis is slightly more dynamic with Skopaic facial features, Lysippean proportions and the typically late Classical/early Hellenistic drapery design. The Apollo by Bryaxis at Daphne is also rather conservative in pose and drapery arrangement but this is not to say that Bryaxis was a traditional sculptor. Rather it shows the customary practice of portraying the god in his Musagetes guise.

Proportions often show the influence of Lysippos. The Kallipolis Kore is elongated to the extreme, and her head is small compared to her total body length. The Zeus by Doidalsas at Nikomedea is slender and elongated, and the pose displays a well developed *contrapposto*, again an indication of its Hellenistic date. The fragments of the Demeter from the temple at Pergamon are restrained and Attic in style and date from the first half of the third century. The Chios Poseidon and the head of Dionysos from Athens are also Attic creations, the former sharing common characteristics with heads from the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos and with Attic grave reliefs, the latter combining Praxitelean

facial features with an elaborate hairstyle and a more vibrant modelling of the skin surfaces.

On the other hand, the heads of Asklepios from Melos and the Demeter in Boston exhibit the seeds of a more dynamic style in the surface tension of skin over bone, massive forms and the vibrant modelling of the hair. They are not Baroque at its most extreme but are Attic in form, influenced by a mixture of late Classical styles, but still more Hellenistic in conception than Classical. In the later third century and into the second, cult images still preserve an Olympian dignity and do not reveal the more extreme characteristics of the Baroque style. Phyromachos' Asklepios, and the Klaros group are perhaps the most conspicuous monuments of the Baroque style with Damophon's cult images comparing with these works and even the Great Altar in the treatment of drapery and facial expressions. The style is also testified in Attika in the second century B.C. with the Mounychia Asklepios, one of the most dynamically modelled sculptures so far found in this region.

The high Hellenistic period, ranging between about 260 - 150 B.C., is perhaps the most vibrant era of sculptural production with drapery taking on a more monumental and elaborate appearance and the carving becoming much more vital. Drapery folds, locks of hair, even eyes are often deeply carved and undercut to produce shadow and contrast. The bearded male deities, such as the Trojan Zeus, the Antyos and the Mounychia Asklepios all exhibit such characteristics. In contrast, female heads from the period tend to appear more like the vibrantly modelled but serene goddesses on the Gigantomachy from Pergamon and in general do not exhibit such pathos in their facial expressions. Their

drapery, however, is often much more dynamic in its treatment. The Klaros group, the Agora/Dion Aphrodites, the cult images at Lykosoura by Damophon and the Capitoline Hera illustrate these tendencies superbly.

Another characteristic of cult images of this period is that the female figures are given a rather sensuous, if somewhat massive form, the gods a powerful musculature. The Klaros goddesses, those at Lykosoura, the Dion/Agora Aphrodites, the Capitoline Hera and the Knossos Persephone are all distinct in their poses and finer details but the rendition of the female form is sumptuous, rounded and full. Their sexuality is often highlighted by their rather swollen abdomens, full breasts and fleshy limbs. This is even more prominent in the naked Aphrodites, such as the Capitoline and Troad types. All of these figures are surprisingly voluptuous considering their proposed ritual function. The first half of the second century was also the period when Apollo and Dionysos became more feminine in form, with their sexuality intensified by the loose nature of the skin over the rather fleshy torsos and abdomens, seen in the Apollo from Tralleis. Drapery also plays a prominent role in highlighting the sensuality of many of the cult images of this period. Even Damophon's rather formal image of Demeter at Lykosoura has a sumptuous form with the chiton clinging closely to the figure beneath. The Agora Aphrodite is one of the most provocative creations of the period, with the drapery emphasising her prominent breasts, abdomen, groin and hips. These examples contrast effectively with the more elongated, slimmer female figures produced during the early and late Hellenistic periods.

The musculature of the gods also differs from the slimmer, leaner creations of the earlier and later Hellenistic periods. The Cherchel Poseidon heralds these massively built gods,

but retains a somewhat flatter musculature than the slightly later Magnesia Zeus, Asklepios from Temple R at Pergamon, the Getty Zeus and the Pergamon Zeus. The inflated muscles and sharp definition of the anatomical forms creates an exaggerated yet naturalistic rendition of the male figure. This is a period of high quality carving with a tendency towards creating powerful images with the marble taking on a plastic quality. Skin textures appear malleable, lying over an inflated musculature, which in turn, rests on a heavy bone structure. Deep cutting of the drapery folds contrasts effectively with flatter areas of material and smooth flesh. Such a technique would have been advantageous in the dark interiors of temples where the sculptor needed to use such devices to display the cult image. Another prominent feature of the cult statues of this period is the so-called press-folds in the garments. These are obvious on cult images from Asia Minor, such as those of the Klaros group, the Magnesia Zeus, the Capitoline Hera and the Pergamene Zeus.

The mid to late second century has yielded few, but nonetheless important cult images. Stylistically these tend to be less dynamic in form and the execution weaker in comparison with the earlier examples. The Melos group reveals such a deterioration in carving standards but the group is not dull or poorly conceived. The technique is somewhat harsher and lacks the plastic quality evident in the Pergamene cult images or Klaros group. In fact the marble often appears rather dry and textural contrasts are less skilfully conceived. The skin of the Poseidon is not so different in texture from the smoother, flatter areas of his garment. The same is also true for the Kore from Kyzikos and the Hygieia from Pheneos. The slightly earlier Aegira Dionysos is still based on the Baroque

principles of design and execution, albeit watered down. Here the sculptor has created a rather effective differentiation between hair and skin.

Another common characteristic of the draped figures is that the material often appears to be rather taut over the legs and clings to the body without appearing diaphanous. In this respect the earlier Hellenistic cult statues such as the Kallipolis Kore and the later Agora Aphrodite show how this was achieved with superb results. A final characteristic is the roll of folds which comprise the upper hem of the himation. This is a feature of the Melos pair and, if Eukleides dates towards the middle of the second century, of his Demeter at Boura. In general the drapery folds are also less deeply wrought than on examples belonging to the high Hellenistic period.

Overall, the fragments of Hellenistic cult images show an extremely high standard of carving and they show some of the finest carvers at work. The contrast between the smooth skin tones and the agitated and voluminous hair and beards of the older male deities is superbly modelled on examples such as the Asklepios from Melos and Mounychia or the Trojan Zeus. The male form is powerfully conceived and anatomical considerations skilfully perceived on both the Zeus from Pergamon and Magnesia on the Maeander. Female figures are no less expertly carved. The heads of the Demeter in Boston and the Kore from Kallipolis, although fathoms apart in terms of their facial expressions and style, are both sensitive portrayals of the Eleusinian deities. Perhaps the greatest achievement of these Hellenistic sculptors is their treatment of drapery. This is evident in other works of the period, but also prominent in cult images. They range from the simple but effective dress of the early Hellenistic Kore from Kallipolis and Demeter

from Pergamon to the elaborate and superbly rendered garments of the Leto from Klaros, the Capitoline Hera, Damophon's Artemis at Lykosoura and the Dion/Agora Aphrodite type. Even on the monumental scale of the Klaros and Lykosoura groups, drapery is imaginative, finely modelled and naturalistic. The embroidered effect on the drapery of Despoina by Damophon is one of the highlights of Hellenistic carving.

Whether this high standard of carving declined within the course of the Hellenistic period, as is the opinion of most scholars, is difficult to determine. Few later second century fragments remain to render a comparison possible. The Amphitrite from Melos, more weakly modelled than her companion Poseidon, and the Kore from Kyzikos show a slightly inferior standard of carving, but this is not to say that this is a general trend of the time. Furthermore, what the Aegira and Pheneos acroliths lack in quality, they more than make up for in effect. We may perhaps expect the finer sculptors to have been employed by the wealthier patrons in the Hellenistic cities of the eastern Aegean. This is evident at Klaros, Pergamon, Magnesia and Sardis, from where some of the finest Hellenistic cult images survive, but for the greatest temples of the period, too little evidence survives for us to draw any such conclusions. Some of the cult images compare well with more securely dated monuments, particularly temple friezes and altar decoration. The altar at Magnesia on the Meander, dated to the later third century, shows figures with drapery arrangements and designs comparable to those of the Zeus from that city and the Klaros sculptures. The Gigantomachy at Pergamon also has parallels in free-standing cult statues, for example the Leto from Klaros, Damophon's cult images and the Trojan Zeus. The Telephos frieze includes figures similar to the head of the Trojan Zeus and the frieze from the temple of Hekate at Lagina, dated towards the last quarter of the second century,

depicts women with the same slender proportions and drapery arrangements as the Amphitrite from Melos, the Kyzikos Kore and the Demeter on the coins from Boura. Stylistic comparisons are, of course, often subjective, but the similarities are often too noticeable to be ignored.

Cult images tend on the whole to modify the excesses of any particular style, to suit the calm atmosphere of a temple setting. It has been stressed throughout the previous chapters that few of the cult statues of the period could be called classicising. It seems more satisfactory to describe the style of certain statues of Athena as deliberately archaising. If a patron required a sculptor to distort the antiquity of a cult image by making it appear more ancient, then we can reasonably expect the sculptor to attempt to recreate Archaic forms and styles rather than those of the Classical period. The latter were more recent creations and not always so distinct from their Hellenistic counterparts as to arouse the respect generated by Archaic and earlier *xoana*. This important issue leads us on to the importance of the sculptor and the wishes of his patron, who often provided the necessary funds for the production and dedication of cult images.

Section B - The sculptors and their patrons

The Sculptors

For the fifty cult images for which either actual fragments or else numismatic, epigraphic or literary evidence is preserved, few of the sculptors are known. Only a dozen sculptors' names are preserved and even these are not always certainly associated with the cult images. We can only hope that more epigraphic evidence from the sites involved will reveal this hidden body of sculptors that Pliny felt fit to ignore: it is he who is really responsible for the lacuna in the history of Greek sculptors during the Hellenistic period. Fortunately Pausanias was rather more revealing but of course he does not always indicate at what time a sculptor was working. This can only be reconstructed from the archaeological remains of temples and the postulated dates for their construction. Yet the preserved names of the sculptors are important additions to the Classical repertoire and although they did not necessarily rival Phidias, Polykleitos and Praxiteles in terms of their reputations in later antiquity, any actual remnants of their work compare favourably with those of Classical masters in terms of technique and proficiency. Furthermore, for the Hellenistic period we can use original cult image fragments to assess their appearance rather than the scores of supposed copies of Classical monuments. The cult images range in date from the early third century to the later second, though more are associated with a particular sculptor from the middle of the period, that is between about 220 and 150 B.C. Yet this tends to be one of either Damophon's or Eukleides' many cult images. More specific problems concerning the dates and styles of these sculptors have already been examined, but here is a convenient place briefly to discuss broader issues such as the

contracts awarded to sculptors such as Damophon and the sons of Polykles, the materials they used, their prestige and the types of cult images they produced for their patrons.

For the early Hellenistic period the sculptors are known through literary and epigraphic evidence but not through actual fragments of cult images. Of the many early Hellenistic sculptors whose names are preserved very few are associated with cult images. Some of these sculptors too are only related to specific cult statues by much later sources and confusion often arises from ambiguous statements in literary texts. Kephisodotos, for example, who worked with Xenophon on the Zeus Soter at Megalopolis, may be the younger of the two known sculptors of that name but it is impossible to be certain. Telesinos is known best from the lengthy inscription in his honour found on Delos, but in the literary record he is obscure. He worked on cult images as well as on portraits for the new Hellenistic royal families. His significance lies in the prestige he must have enjoyed and the wealth he may have acquired before his generous gift to the sanctuary of Delos. So little is known about the social standing of Greek sculptors that such a small piece of information is invaluable. The inscriptions found at Messene show Damophon to have been equally prosperous: his numerous contracts must have generated a great amount of wealth. Bryaxis is a more shady character and is known from only a handful of statues, all of which appear to have been commissioned by the Hellenistic monarchs Ptolemy I and Seleukos I. If in fact Doidalsas did exist and is not a product of the misreading of historical texts, he also had his major contract for royalty and it is suggested that he may have been a native of Bithynia, so perhaps his work was known by his patron. This royal connection is further supported with the case of Phyromachos who allegedly produced the Asklepios at Pergamon. It has been suggested that both this sculptor and the slightly older

Nikeratos worked as court sculptors for the early Attalid kings, their repertoire ranging from mythological groups, royal and historical portraits to cult images. Their significance lies in the fact that they originated in Athens and so, along with Telesinos and possibly Bryaxis, they demonstrate the eastward migration of Attic sculptors during the third century B.C.

The later third century and second centuries saw sculptors not having to travel so far from their place of origin and training to find work. Both Damophon and possibly Eukleides produced cult images in the revived towns in the Peloponnese, probably during the period of the Achaean League's influence there. The sons of Polykles worked, on the other hand, for the rival Aetolian League, but also looked much further afield for employment, serving patrons in Rome when cult images were being commissioned there in the second century B.C. Pliny is our best source for the works attributed to this family, but he fails to mention Damophon and Eukleides, whose work was confined to a smaller geographical area.⁵ Fortunately Pausanias has a particular fondness for Damophon, perhaps due to the sculptor's two important groups of Demeter and Kore/Despoina, Pausanias's favourite deities. For the Messenian sculptor Damophon much material survives from which to determine his style. Indeed, as stressed earlier, more original fragments of his statues survive than of any other Greek sculptor from any period. For Eukleides, who was almost as prolific as Damophon in producing cult statues for cities in the Peloponnese, the picture is less satisfying as no original fragments can be identified. Only possible sketchy coin reproductions of some of his statues can be distinguished.

⁵ Pliny, NH, 36.35.

The date of Damophon has also been shuffled about through history, but has recently found what may be its most appropriate location in the last quarter of the third century into the first decade of the second; it is by no means secure. Eukleides is more difficult to locate chronologically, particularly now that his association with the fragments from Aegira must be discredited. The remaining Hellenistic sculptors relevant here, Xenophilos and Stratos, Attalos and Eucheiros, have been dated by epigraphic evidence and dating by letter forms is notoriously unreliable. Thus the chronological picture must remain rather vague but at least the names of certain sculptors are recorded and can be associated with certain original cult images and with copies. Coinage can be useful for identification of types and sometimes shows specific cult statues but cannot communicate the style. Even though few sculptors are named as producers of Hellenistic cult images, those whose lives and work are even partially documented can demonstrate interesting trends. The three Athenian sculptors moved across the Aegean for work and, in order to secure employment, they became masters of many genres, mythological groups, historical and royal portraits and cult images. Other Attic sculptors must have also migrated to the islands and farther east to find work, producing such cult statues as the Asklepios of Melos, the Chios Poseidon and the Pergamene Demeter. Second century sculptors are known primarily for their cult images but may also have produced other types of sculpture.

Financing of cult statues in the Hellenistic period

A glance at the chart shows just how few of the cult images of the Hellenistic period can be associated with specific individuals or groups who may have provided the necessary finance for their dedication. This is perhaps not surprising as many of them were placed

in temples within cities, where the treasury would have provided the money. The main problem is whether we can say that if a cult image was dedicated during the reign of a particular king, it was he who was the patron. He may well have been, but the cost would probably not have come out of his own pocket but rather from the city's treasury. This was probably the case at Pergamon, Nikomedeia and perhaps Daphne near Antioch. The commissioning and dedicating of cult images, particularly in those cities that required many new cult images and statues that were colossal in scale and richly embellished, must have been very expensive. Private patronage of cult images is certainly possible and shown by a few examples dating to the Hellenistic period. Other cities in Asia Minor came under the influence of different ruling dynasties at various times throughout the period. At Sardis, Teos and Klaros, the Seleukid influence was particularly prominent in the third century and it is thought that Seleukos I may have initiated the foundation of the colossal temple of Artemis at Sardis. The promotion of cults by the Seleukid dynasty is a particularly interesting case and deserves attention here.

Because of the myths surrounding the origin of the Seleukid dynasty and the Seleukids' claim to be descendants of Apollo, the early members of the ruling family are associated with several building projects and dedications in sanctuaries of the god and his sister Artemis. At Didyma Seleukos I's return of the Archaic cult image brought him popularity at the shrine and also at nearby Miletos, where there was another sanctuary of the god. The motive behind such generosity towards shrines was obviously as much to enhance the popularity of the monarch as to develop the cult of the god. Grainger, in his analysis of Seleukos I, states that one of the most successful ways to establish a reputation in a

certain region was to patronise a shrine.⁶ This was a calculated move on the part of the king; the oracle at Didyma had predicted divinity for Alexander the Great and so any association of Seleukos with the shrine would suggest parallels both with Alexander and, more importantly, with deification. Not only was Seleukos attempting to legitimise his rule by claiming descent from Apollo, but he was also aspiring to be regarded as a saviour and patron of Apollo at Didyma, by returning the cult image. His possible funding of the early stages of the temple of Artemis at Sardis is not as easy to explain but again he was reviving an ancient cult and modernising it in the process. Yet it is not known whether he financed the cult image of Artemis. Later in the century another Seleukid, Achaios, is connected with the cult image of Zeus erected in the temple but again his exact role in terms of finance is not certain. Hanfmann suggested that the cult statue of Zeus may have been intended to incorporate a portrait of the king, but too little remains of this image to substantiate such a claim.

Another Seleukid king, Antiochos III has been associated with the cult images at Klaros, which would again indicate the dynasty's promotion of the cult of Apollo. The sanctuary at Klaros was under the control of Kolophon, but this city's role in the financing of the temple and its expensive cult group is uncertain. The inscribed statue base, bearing the names Antiochos III and the later Antiochos IV, is not in itself an indication that these kings paid for the dedication but it does suggest their influence at the shrine. To have received possible portrait statues there perhaps indicates some form of benefaction.

Epigraphic evidence also points to patronage of the temple of Dionysus at Teos on the part of the Seleukid Antiochos III and his wife Stratonike. A lengthy inscription reports *

⁶ Grainger, 1990,2.

that portraits of the king and queen were erected in the cella of the temple next to the cult image of Dionysus and lists the equal honours bestowed upon the couple. Such privileges must surely indicate that the royal pair were financial benefactors of the temple, and donors perhaps of its cult image, but again their exact role is unclear. It may have been that the recently re-organised eastern branch of the Guilds of Dionysus also provided funds for the temple and its image.

The other deity that the Seleukid dynasty favoured was Zeus. At Lebadeia we know that Antiochos IV donated money to construct the temple and perhaps the cult image. He also gave money for the continuation of the Olympieion in Athens but as at Lebadeia, the project was not completed during his rule. Overall the Seleukid promotion of the cult of Apollo and other deities is attested epigraphically and in the literary record, but how far they can actually be termed financiers of cult images is, as yet, unresolved.

The Attalid kings are not known to have donated money towards the erecting of cult statues in sanctuaries in their territory but they did dedicate many cult images in their capital. We know from inscriptions that the temple of Demeter at Pergamon was * constructed by Philetairos and Eumenes I in honour of their mother Boa, but we cannot infer from this information who actually paid for the cult statue. Attalos II was the patron of the temple of Hera, and portrait statues of the king and his wife Stratonike may have stood within the cella, in emulation of the divine pair.

The Cappadocian prince Orophernes' possible donation of private wealth to furnish the temple at Priene with a cult image is another instance of royal patronage. This adopted

son of Ariathes IV had accumulated wealth and had deposited it inside the temple of Athena during his troubled bid for power. During his brief period of absolute rule in Cappadocia he may have reclaimed his money and possibly donated the money for the long needed cult statue of the goddess. This is not confirmed by any other source than the finding of several coins bearing his portrait under the cult statue base. The historical considerations behind such a benefaction are fraught with difficulties, although Orophernes must be the prime candidate for the role of patron for the cult image of Athena Polias.

Ptolemaic influence in the Aegean islands is attested epigraphically as well as in the literary record, but there are no obvious instances of the Ptolemies donating money towards cult images outside Egypt. The islands of the eastern Aegean, such as Kos and Rhodes, developed several of their sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period, but the source of funds for their numerous cult images is unknown. The islands of the Cyclades, such as Delos, Tenos and Melos, have also yielded little epigraphic evidence as to the source of revenue for cult statues.

Cities in the Peloponnese may have benefited financially during the years of their membership of the Achaean League and developed their sanctuaries and installed new cult images during that period. Messene, Megalopolis, Boura, Aegion and Aegira were architecturally embellished during the third century and the first half of the second and commissioned new cult images for their temples. The patrons may have been the cities rather than wealthy royal or private donors but there is no evidence either way. Rural shrines like Lykosoura may have depended upon individual benefactors, possibly initiates in the mysteries, to finance the cult group but again little is known.

Non-royal benefactors may also have been responsible for the payment or at least part-payment of the cost of some cult images. We have, however, information about only one such donor, who provided the cult image of Aphrodite at Dion. The dedicator, and presumably the person who paid for the cult statue, was a freed woman, our only example of a female donor.

Non-royal patronage and possible subscriptions may have been the stimulus for the dedication of certain cult images of Dionysos during the Hellenistic period. The guilds of artists, known as *technitai*, may have been responsible for the cult statues of the god at Teos and Aegira and possibly at Pergamon, if royal patronage was not the source of funding for the first and last of these. The guilds paid performers at dramatic and music festivals and had the considerable financial means required to purchase land, so it is reasonable to suggest that they may have financed architectural projects and possibly images of their patron deity. Again little evidence survives to support such a theory. Private patronage of cult statues must have played an important role in the erecting of cult statues and royal benefactors are suggested in historical texts but there is simply not enough evidence for the surviving sculptures. It is difficult then to adequately evaluate the question of the financing of Hellenistic cult images in a period when more is known about private dedications in general.

The preceding chapters have attempted to analyse what evidence there is for the cult images of the Olympian gods that were produced during the period 325 - 100 B.C. The wealth of material considered and studied reveals how the Olympian gods were still important constituents of the sculptor's repertoire. Any attacks on the Olympians by philosophers and playwrights during the late Classical and early Hellenistic period did not affect the number of cult statues dedicated. Furthermore, the promotion of certain Olympians by the new Hellenistic monarchies prompted new temples to be constructed in their capital cities and in sanctuaries within their territories. If fewer temples were built in certain cities or sanctuaries, this was probably largely due to the fact that a temple for a particular deity already existed. It is hoped that future excavations will yield new evidence for cult images, as is presently the case at Messene and Dion. The variety of styles evident in the surviving sculptures shows that sculptors neither slavishly reproduced earlier types nor felt restricted by any religious conservatism limiting the development of an individual deity's iconography. The continued representation of important cult statues on coinage suggests how significant and celebrated such statues were for the cities as it served to broadcast these religious idols throughout the Hellenistic world and beyond.

There were few radical changes in the iconography of each god, though Apollo, Dionysos and Aphrodite were occasionally transformed. Nor were there any changes in the conception of cult images and how they should appear in temples. They continued to embody the general characteristics of each particular deity and held the attributes that made them instantly recognisable to the devotees of the cult, even if the loss of these attributes may render an exact identification difficult today. Yet Smith makes a poignant observation when he states that it was the Hellenistic cult images which provided the

models for later Roman cult statues of the Olympians.⁷ This is particularly true for Hellenistic cult statues of Zeus, copied and adapted for images of Jupiter all over the Roman empire.

The styles in which these cult statues and groups were carved did change, as has been made clear. There are no significant regional variations or chronological differences to suggest that certain deities became more popular at certain times or in particular areas. Olympians such as Ares, Hephaistos, Hestia and Hermes, who had not had large temples dedicated to them in previous periods, are not well represented in cult images during the Hellenistic period. Asklepios of course, a relative newcomer to the Olympian pantheon, is better known from his Hellenistic cult statues than from Classical examples, but he is shown through more or less the same types as Zeus or Poseidon, his character defined by the attributes.

The preserved Hellenistic cult images and groups have received little attention in general studies of Greek sculpture: not only are they more numerous than surviving Classical cult images but they form an important core of original Hellenistic material. Although all too often little is known of the sanctuaries from which they come, or the cults they represent, they are worth studying both for the variety of styles they display and for the assistance they can provide in the reconstruction of the personalities, careers and working practices of the sculptors who carved and assembled them.

⁷ Smith, 1993,157.

Abbreviations

AA	Archäologischer Anzeiger
A Delt	Archaiologikon Deltion
Arch Cl	Archeologia Classica
Arch Ephem	Archaiologike Ephemeris
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AM	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung
AS Atene	Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente
AvP	Altertümer von Pergamon
BICS	Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies
BSA	Annual of the British School at Athens
BCH	Bulletin de correspondance hellénique
DaM	Damaszener Mitteilungen
Ergon	To Ergon tes Archaiologikes Etaireias
Hermogenes	Hoepfner, W., and Schwandner, E.L., Hermogenes und die Hochhellenistische Architektur
IstMitt	Istanbuler Mitteilungen
JdI	Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
LIMC	Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae

ÖjH	Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien
PAPS	Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society
Phyromachos	Phyromachos-Probleme mit einem Anhang zur Datierung des Grossen Altares von Pergamon, Mainz, 1990
Praktika	Praktika tes Akademias Athenon
RA	Revue archéologique
RM	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung

Bibliography

- Ajootian,A., 1990**, Hermaphroditos in LIMC V, 268-285, Zurich and Munich
- Akurgal,E., 1970**, Ancient civilizations and ruins of Turkey, Istanbul
- Akurgal,E., 1987**, Griechische und Römische Kunst in der Turkei, Munich
- Alroth,B., 1989**, Greek God and figurines, Uppsala
- Alscher,L., 1957**, Griechische Plastik IV - Hellenismus, Berlin
- Andreae,B., 1990**, Der Asklepios der Phyromachos, in, Phyromachos, Mainz, 45-99
- Ashmole,B., 1929**, Catalogue of the Ince Blundell sculptures, Oxford
- Ashmole,B., 1951(1)** Demeter of Cnidus, in, JHS 71, 13-28
- Ashmole,B., 1951(2)**, The poise of the Blacas head, in, BSA 46, 2-6
- Ashmole,B., and Yalouris,N., 1967**, Olympia, the sculpture of the Temple of Zeus,
London
- Austin,M.M., 1981 (reprint 1989)**, The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman
Conquest, Cambridge
- Bartmann,E., 1992**, Ancient sculptural copies in Miniature, Leiden
- Bean,G.E., 1989 (reprint)** Aegean Turkey, Bath
- Becatti,G., 1935**, Timarchides e L'Apollon qui tenet Citharam, in, Bulletino della
Commissione Archeologica comunale di Roma 63, 111-132
- Becatti,G., 1940**, Attika, saggio sulla scultura Attika dell' Ellenismo, in, Rivista dell'
Istituto d'Arch e storie dell Arte 6-7, 7-79
- Bellinger,A.R., 1961**, Troy - the coins, supplementary monographs 2, Princeton
- Bernard,P., and Salviat,F., 1959**, Nouvelles Découvertes au Dionysion de Thasos, in,
BCH 83, 288-335

- Bernard,V., 1890**, Statue Archaique de Tegée, in, BCH 14, 382-384
- Beschi,L., 1988**, Demeter in LIMC IV, 844-892
- Bieber,M., 1923-4**, Die Sohne des Praxiteles, in, JDI 38-9, 242-75
- Bieber,M., 1957**, A bronze statue in Cincinnati and its place in the history of the Asklepios types, in, PAPS 101, 70-92
- Bieber,M., 1961**, The sculpture of the Hellenistic age 2nd ed., New York
- Bieber,M., 1977**, Ancient Copies, New York
- Blinkenberg,C., 1917**, L'Image d'Athana Lindia, Copenhagen
- Borbein,A.H., 1988**, Zum Asklepios Blacas, in, Kanon, Festschrift Ernst Berger, Basel
- Brinkerhoff,D.M., 1971**, Figures of Venus Creative and derivative, in, Studies for G.M.A.Hanfmann, Maine, 1971
- Brinkerhoff,D.M., 1978**, Hellenistic statues of Aphrodite, New York and London
- Brize,P., 1990**, Göttin oder Kaiserin ?, in, Ist Mitt 40, 179
- Bruneau,P., 1970**, Recherches sur les cultes de Délos a l'Epoque Hellénistique et a l'époque imperiale, Paris
- Bruneau,P., and Ducat,J., 1983**, Guide de Délos, Paris
- Bruskari,M., 1988**, Eine Nadenliche Dionysos, in, Öjh 59, 53-62
- Burford,A., 1969**, The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros, Liverpool
- Burkert,W., 1985**, Greek Religion, Oxford
- Burr,D., 1934**, Terracottas from Myrina, in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Vienna
- Butler,H.C., 1922**, Sardis, Volume 1, part 1, Leiden
- Carpenter,R., 1960**, Greek Sculpture, Chicago
- Carter,J.C., 1983**, The sculpture of the sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene, London

- Caskey,L.D., 1916(1),** A Greek head of a goddess in the Museum of Fine Arts Boston, in, *AJA* 20, 383-90
- Caskey,L.D., 1916(2),** A Greek head of a goddess, in, *Museum of Fine Arts Boston, Bulletin* 14, 10-11
- Caskey,L.D., 1923,** Boston Museum, catalogue of Sculpture, Boston
- Chase,G.H., 1924,** Greek and Roman sculpture in American Collections, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Coarelli,F., 1969,** Polykles, in, *Studi Miscellanei* 15, Rome, 75-89
- Colini,A.M., 1980,** Gortina, in, *A Delt* 29, 1973-4 Athens
- Collignon,M., 1888,** Tête en marbre trouvée à Tralles, in *RA*, 289-295
- Collignon,M., 1889,** Statue en marbre trouvée à Milo, in, *BCH* 13, 489-503
- Collins-Clinton,J., 1993,** A Hellenistic torso from Cosa, in, *Eius Virtutis Studiosi, Classical and Post Classical Studies in memory of Frank-Edward Brown, Hanover and London*
- Courby,F., and Picard,C., 1924,** *Recherches Archéologiques à Stratos d'Acarnanie, Paris*
- Davesne,A., 1987,** Le Temple de Dionysos à Teos, in, *Révue Numismatique* 29, 15-20
- De Juliis, E., and Loiacono.D., 1985,** Taranto: Il Museo Archeologico, Taranto
- Delivorrias,A., 1984,** Aphrodite, in, *LIMC II, Zurich and Munich*, 1-151
- De Lucca,G., 1984,** Das Asklepieion - *AvP* 11,4, Berlin, 143-148
- De Lucca,G., 1990,** Asklepios in Pergamon, in *Phyromachos, Mainz*
- Demangel,R., and Laumonier,A., 1925,** Fouilles de Notion, in, *BCH* 49, 322-3
- Demargne,P., 1984,** Athena in *LIMC II*, 955-1044
- Despinis,G., 1966,** Eine neues werk des Damophon, in, *AA*, 378-385
- Despinis,G., 1975,** Akrolitha, Athens

- Deubner,O., 1934**, Hellenistische Apollo Gestalten, Athens
- Devambez,P., 1940**, Sculptures d'un monument chorégique à Thasos, in, *Monuments and Memories* 38, 93-116
- Dickins,G., 1905-6**, Damophon of Messene, in *BSA* 12, 109-36
- 1906-7**, *BSA*, 13, 357-404
- 1910-11**, *BSA*, 17, 80-87
- Dickins,G., 1971 (reprint)**, Hellenistic Sculpture, Maryland
- Diepolder,H., 1931**, Die Attische Grabreliefs, Berlin
- Dörig,J., 1973**, Le Dionysos de l'Helicon, oeuvre de Lysippe, in, *Antike Plastik* 12, Berlin 125-132
- Dörpfeld,W., 1908**, Die Bauwerke, Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1906-7, in, *AM* 33, 328-330
- Durrbach,F., and Roussel,P., 1935**, Inscriptions de Délos, Paris
- Erim,K.T., 1986**, Aphrodisias, City of Venus Aphrodite, London
- Etienne,R., and Braun,J., 1986**, Tenos I - Le sanctuaire de Poseidon et d'Amphitrite, Paris
- Farnell,L.R., 1896-1909**, The cults of the Greek states, 5 volumes, Oxford
- Felletti,B.M., 1951**, Afrodite Pudica, in, *Arch Class* 3, 33-65
- Fergusson,J., 1989**, Among the Gods, London and New York, 1989
- Flashar,M., 1992**, Apollo Kitharodos, Vienna
- Flashar,M., 1993**, Grabungen in Klaros, in, *Antike Welt*, Mainz am Rheim, 63-5
- Flashar,M., and von den Hoff,R., 1993**, Die Statue der sogenannten Philosophen Delphi im Kontext einer mehrfigurigen Stiftung, in, *BCH* 117, 407-33

- Fleischer,R., 1973**, Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien in Syrien, Leiden
- Frel,J. 1971**, The Rhodian workmanship of the Alexander Sarcophagus, in, *Ist Mitt* 21, 38-43
- Fullerton,M.D., 1990**, The Archaistic style in Roman Statuary, Leiden
- Gasparri,C., 1986**, Dionysos in *LIMC III*, 414-514
- Gordon,R., 1972**, Fear of freedom ? Selective continuity in religion during the Hellenistic period, in, *Didaskalos* 4, 48-60
- Grainger,J.D., 1990**, Seleukos Nikator, London
- Gualandi,G., 1969**, Artemis Hekate - un problema di Tipologia nella scultura Ellenistica, in, *RA*, 233-272
- Habicht, W.C., 1985**, Pausanias' guide to Ancient Greece, University of California Press, 1985
- Hadas,M., 1972**, Hellenistic culture, New York
- Hanfmann.G and Frazer, 1975**, in Hanfmann and Waldbaum, A survey of Sardis and the major monuments outside the city walls, Cambridge, Massachussets and London, 1975
- Hanfmann,G., and Ramage,N., 1978**, Sardis - the sculpture, Harvard University Press
- Hanfmann,G., and Mierse.W.E., 1983**, Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman times, Harvard University Press
- Hansen,E.V., 1971**, (first edition 1947), The Attalids of Pergamon, Cornell, 1971
- Harrison,E.B., 1990**, Aphrodite Hegemone in the Athenian Agora, in, *Akten Des XIII International Kongress fur Klassische Archaologie*, Berlin, Mainz, 330
- Hasluck,F.W., 1901-2**, Sculptures from Kyzilkos, in, *BSA* 8, 193-4
- Havelock,C.M., 1981**, Hellenistic Art, New York and London

- Hepding,H., 1908**, Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon, III, Die Einzelfunde, in, AM 33, 494-6
- Herbert,B., 1989**, Schriftquellen zur Hellenistischen Kunst, Horn-Graz
- Herington,C.J., 1955**, Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias, Manchester
- Higgins,R., 1986**, Tanagra and the figurines, Princeton
- Himmelmann,N., 1989**, Herrscher und Athlet, Die Bronzen von Quirinal, Milan
- Hoffmann,E., 1965**, Eine weibliche Sitzfigur aus Kyzikos, in, Ist Mitt 15, 65-70
- Hoepfner,W., und Schwandner,E.L., 1991**, Hermogenes und die Hochhellenistische Architektur, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein
- Holden,B.M., 1964**, The Metopes of the Temple of Athena at Ilion, Northampton
Massachusetts
- Holzmann,B., 1984**, Asklepios in LIMC II, Zurich and Munich, 763-897
- Horn,R., 1931**, Stehende Weibliche Gewandstatuen in der Hellenistischen Plastik, Munich
- Horn,R., 1934**, Ein bartiger Gotterkopf um Chios in Wien, in, Corolla Ludwig, Curtius,
Stuttgart, 104-107
- Horn,R., 1938**, Hellenistische Kopfe II, in, RM 53, 70-90
- Horn,R., 1972**, Samos XII - Hellenistische Bildwerke auf Samos, Bonn
- Imhoof Blumer,F.W., and Gardner,P., 1964**, Ancient Coins illustrating lost
masterpieces of Greek Art - a numismatic commentary on Pausanias. New enlarged edition
with introduction, commentary and notes by A.N.Oikonomides, Chicago
- Ippel,A., 1912**, Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1910-11, III, Die Einzelfunde, in, AM 37, 316-
326
- Jacobsthal,P., 1908**, Die Einzelfunde, die Arbeiten zu Pergamon, in, AM 33, 421-423
- Jacopi,G., 1931**, Monumenti di Scultura II, in, Clara Rodos 5, Bergamo
- Jockey,P., 1993**, Fragments de statues féminines drapées de Délos, in, BCH 117, 436-80

- Johnson,F.P., 1927**, Lysippos, Durham
- Jost,M., 1985**, Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie, Paris
- Kabus-Preisshofen,R., 1975**, Statuetten gruppen aus dem Demeter Heiligtum bei Kyparissi auf Kos, in, Antike Plastik 15, 31-64
- Kabus-Preisshofen,R., 1989** Die Hellenistische Plastik der Insel Kos, Berlin
- Kaempf-Dimitriadou, 1981**, Amphitrite in LIMC I, Zurich and Munich, 724-35
- Kahil,L., 1984**, Artemis in LIMC II, Zurich and Munich, 618-753
- Karouzou,S., 1968**, National Archaeological Museum, Athens; collection of sculpture, Athens
- Kern,O., 1892**, Das Kultbild der Göttinnen von Eleusis, in, AM 17, 125-142
- Khramer,G., 1925**, Nachahmung des V Jahrhunderts in Pergamenischen Statuen, in, RM 40, 67-106
- Kleiner,G., 1942**, Tanagrafiguren, Berlin
- Köhle and Watzinger, 1904**, Magnesia am Maeander, Berlin
- Konstantinou,I.K., 1953-4**, Agalma Kathemenis Theas, in, A Ephem, 30-40
- Kourouniotou,K., 1911**, Katalogos tou Mouseiou Lykosouras, Athens
- Kraay,C.M., 1966**, Greek Coins, London
- Kranz,P., 1989**, Die Asklepiosstatue im Schlosspark von Klein-Glienicke. Ein neuer Typus und sein kulturgeschichtlicher Hintergrund, in, JDI 104, 107-155
- Krause,B., 1972**, Zum Asklepios Kultbild des Thrasymedes in Epidauros, in, AA 87, 240-57
- Lambrinudakis,W., 1984**, Apollon in LIMC II, Zurich and Munich, 183-327
- Landwehr,C., 1990**, Die Sitz statue eines bartigen Gottes in Cherchel, in, Phylomachos, Mainz, 101-122

- Laubscher,H.P., 1966**, Skulpturen aus Tralles, in, *Ist Mitt* 16, 115-129
- Laurenzi,L., 1950**, La Personalità di Doidalses di Bitinia, in, *As Atene* 8-10, 1946-8, Rome
- Lauter,H., 1986**, Die Architektur des Hellenismus, Darmstadt
- Lawrence,A.W., 1927**, Later Greek Sculpture, Bradford and London
- Lawrence,A.W., 1983**, Greek Architecture, revised by Tomlinson, Oxford
- Leipen,N., 1971**, The Athena Parthenos - a reconstruction, Toronto
- Le Roy,C., 1991**, Le développement monumental du Létôon de Xanthos, in, *RA*, 341-351
- Leveque,P., 1950**, Aphrodite Pudique, in, *BCH* 74, 65-69
- Levi,P., 1988**, Pausanias' Guide to Greece volumes 1,2, London
- Lévy,E., and Marcadé,J., 1972**, Au Musee de Lykosoura, in, *BCH* 96, 967-1004
- Linfert,A., 1976**, Kunstzentren Hellenistischer Zeit, studien an Weiblichen Gewandfiguren, Wiesbaden
- Linfert, A., 1983**, Der Apollon von Daphne des Bryaxis, in, *DaM* 1, 165-173
- Lippold,G., 1923**, Kopien und Umbildungen Griechischer Statuen, Munich
- Lullies, R., 1954**, Die Kauernde Aphrodite, Munich
- Madigan, B., 1991**, A Transposed head, in, *Hesperia* 60, 503-10
- Manderscheid, H., 1981**, Die Skulpturenausstattung der kaiserzeitlichen Thermenlagen, Berlin
- Marcadé, J., 1957**, Recueil des signatures de Sculpteurs Grecs, 1 and 2, Paris
- Marcadé, J. 1969**, Au Musée de Délos, étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découvertes dans l'île, Paris
- Marcadé, J., 1976**, Tête féminine du Létôon de Xanthos, in, *RA*, 113-120
- Martin,H.G., 1987**, Römische Tempelkultbilder, Rome

- Martin, L.H., 1987,** Hellenistic Religions, Oxford
- Mylonas, G.E., 1961,** Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, New Jersey
- Mendel, G., 1912-14,** Musées Impériaux Ottomans, Catalogue des Sculptures grecques, romaines et byzantines, Constantinople
- Merker, G., 1973,** The Hellenistic sculpture of Rhodes, Goteborg
- Metraux, G.P.R., 1971,** A new head of Zeus from Sardis, in, AJA 75, 156-159
- Meyer, M., 1988,** Erfindung und Wirkung. Zum Asklepios Giustini, in, AM 103, 119-159
- Morrow, K.D., 1985,** Greek footwear and the dating of sculpture, Wisconsin
- Niemier, J.P., 1985,** Kopien und Nachahmungen in Hellenismus, Bonn
- Ohlemutz, E., 1968,** Die Kulte und Heiligtümer der Götter in Pergamon, Darmstadt
- Olmos, R., 1986,** Eileithyia in LIMC III, Zurich and Munich, 685-699
- Özgan, R., 1982,** Zur Datierung des Artemisaltars in Magnesia am Maeander, in, Ist Mitt 32, 196-208
- Özgünel, C., 1990,** Das Fundament des Smintheion, in, Hermogenes, 35-44
- Palagia, O., 1980,** Euphranor, Leiden
- Palagia, O., 1982,** A colossal statue of a personification from the Agora at Athens, in, Hesperia 51, 99-113
- Pandermalis, D., 1982,** Eine Neues Heiligtum in Dion, in, AA, 727-35
- Pandermalis, D., 1981,** Anaskaphe Dion in Praktika, Athens, 1983, 62-66
- Papachatzes, N., Pausaniou hellados Periegesis (5 volumes)**
- 1974,** Attika - Athens
- 1976,** Korinthia and Lakonia - Athens
- 1979,** Messenia and Elis - Athens
- 1980,** Achaia and Arkadia - Athens

1981, Boiotia and Phokis - Athens

Papadopoulos,J., 1980, Xoana e Sphyrelata, Rome

Paribeni,E., 1959, Catalogo delle Sculture di Cirene, Rome

Paris,P., 1892, Élatée, Paris

Parke,H.W., 1985, The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor, London

Pfrommer,M., 1986, Bemerkungen zum Tempel von Messa auf Lesbos, in, Ist Mitt 36, 77-94

Pfuhl,E., and Möbius,H., 1977, Die Ostgriechischen Grabreliefs, volumes I,II, Mainz

Picard, C., 1963, Manual d'Archéologie Grecque IV, la sculpture:période Classique - IV siècle, deuxième partie, Paris

Pickard-Cambridge, 1953, The Dramatic Festivals of Athens, Oxford, revised by Gould and Lewis (revised 1988)

Pinkwart,D., 1973, Weibliche Gewandstatuen aus Magnesia, in, Antike Plastik 12, Berlin, 149-160

Plassart, A., 1928, Délos XI, Les Sanctuaires et les cultes du Mont Cynthe, Paris

Pochmarski,E., 1972-3, Neue Beobachtungen zum Typus Sardanapalos, in, ÖjH 50, 41-67

Pochmarski,E., 1974, Das Bild des Dionysos in der Rundplastik der klassischen Zeit Griechenlands, Wien

Pochmarski,E., 1990, Dionysische Gruppen, Vienna

Pollitt,J.J., 1972, Art and experience in Classical Greece, Cambridge

Pollitt, J.J., 1986, Art in the Hellenistic Age, Cambridge

Pollitt, J.J., 1990, The Art of Ancient Greece, Cambridge

Price,M.J., and Trell,B.L., 1977, Coins and their Cities, London

Protonotariou-Deliaké,E., 1961, Anaskaphe Pheneou, in, A Delt 17, Athens, 57-61

- Queyrel,F., 1989**, Art Pergaménien, histoire, Collections Le Perse du Muse d'Aix et le petit ex-voto attalide, in, RA, 253-296
- Radt,W., 1981**, Der 'Alexanderkopf' in Istanbul, in, AA, 583-596
- Radt,W., 1988**, Pergamon, Geschichte und Bauten, Funde und Einforschung einer antiken Metropole, Köln
- Regling,K., 1924**, Die Antike Munze als Kunstwerke, Berlin
- Richter,G.M.A., 1954**, Catalogue of Greek sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Oxford, 1954
- Ridgway,B.S., 1967**, The bronze lady from the sea, in, Expedition, Fall 3-9
- Ridgway,B.S., 1976**, The Aphrodite of Arles, in, AJA 80, 147-54
- Ridgway,B.S., 1990**, Hellenistic Sculpture 1, Bristol
- Robertson,D.S., 1988**, Greek and Roman Architecture, Cambridge
- Robertson,M., 1975**, A History of Greek Art, Cambridge
- Romano,I.B., 1982**, Early Greek Idols, in, Expedition, Spring
- Romano,I.B., 1988**, Early Greek Cult Images and Cult Practices, in, Early Greek Cult Practice, edited by Hägg, Marinatos, and Nordquist, Stockholm, 127-134
- Roux,G., 1961**, L'architecture de l'Argolide aux IV et III siecles avant J.C., Paris
- Schafer,J., 1968**, Der Poseidon von Melos, in, Antike Plastik 8, 55-67
- Schalles,H.J., 1985**, Untersuchungen zur Kulturpolitik der Pergamenischen Herrscher in dritten Jahrhundert vor Christus, Tübingen
- Schede,M., 1928**, Griechische und Römische Sculpturen des Antikenmuseums, Constantinople, Berlin and Leipzig
- Schober,A., 1933**, Der Fries des Hekateions von Lagina, Wien
- Schober,A., 1951**, Die Kunst von Pergamon, Innsbruck - Wien

- Schmidt,E., 1965**, The Great Altar of Pergamon, London
- Schwandner,E.L., 1990**, Beobachtungen zur Hellenistischen Tempelarchitektur von Pergamon, in, Hermogenes, 85-102
- Seyrig,H., 1963**, Monnaies Hellenistiques, in Revue Numismatique, VI series, part V, Paris
- Shear,T.L., 1933**, Statue of a goddess in the Agora, in, AJA 37, 542-544
- Six,J., 1922**, Asklepios by Bryaxis, in, JHS 42, 31-35
- Smith,A.H., 1892-1904**, A Catalogue of sculpture in the department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, (3 volumes), London
- Smith,R.R.R., 1988**, Hellenistic Royal Portraits, Oxford
- Smith,R.R.R., 1991**, Hellenistic Sculpture, London
- Smith,R.R.R., 1993**, The Hellenistic Period, in, The Oxford History of Classical Art, ed. J.Boardman, Oxford, 151-216
- Stahler,K.P., 1966**, Das Unklassische im Telephosfrieze, Munster
- Stewart,A.F., 1977**, Skopas of Paros, New Jersey
- Stewart,A.F., 1979**, Attika: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age, in, JHS Suppl.14, London
- Stewart,A.F., 1982**, Dionysos at Delphi, in, Studies in History of Art 10, Macedonia and Greece in late Classical period and early Hellenistic times, Washington
- Stewart,A.F., 1990**, Greek Sculpture - an exploration, New Haven and London
- Stillwell,R., 1976**, The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites, Princeton
- Sturgeon,M.C., 1987**, Isthmia IV, The Sculpture, 1952-67, Princeton
- Süsserott,H.K., 1938**, Griechische Plastik des 4.Jahrhunderts vor Christus, Frankfurt

- Symeonoglou,S., 1985**, The topography of Thebes from the Bronze Age to Modern Times, Princeton
- Themelis,P., 1993(1)**, Damophon kai drastepoieta tou sten Arkadia, in, *Sculpture in Arkadia and Lakonia*, ed. Palagia,O. and Coulsen,W., Oxford, 99-110
- Themelis,P., 1993(2)**, Damophon von Messene. Sein Werk im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen, in, *Antike Kunst*, 24-40
- Thiemann,E., 1959**, Hellenistische Vatergöttheiten, Munster Westf.
- Thimme,D., 1946**, The Masters of the Pergamon Gigantomachy, in, *AJA* 50, 345-357
- Todd, W.M. and Wace, A.J.B., 1906**, A Catalogue of the Sparta Museum, Oxford
- Travlos,J., 1971**, Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens, London
- Uz,D.M., 1990**, The Temple of Dionysos at Teos, in, *Hermogenes*, 51-61
- Vanderpool,E., 1959**, Pheneos, in, *AJA* 63, 281
- Vasori,O., 1979**, in Museo Nazionale Romano, *Le Sculture I/1*, Rome
- Vermeule,C.C., 1969-70**, Head of major divinity, perhaps Hera or Demeter, in, *Classical Journal* 65, 57-58
- Vermeule,C.C., and Comstock,M.B., 1976**, *Sculpture in Stone. Greek, Roman and Etruscan Collections of the Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston, Boston
- Vermeule,C.C., 1977**, The Heroic Graeco - Roman Zeus from Marbury Hall, in, *Getty Journal* 5, 43-45
- Vermeule,C.C., 1980**, *Greek Art, from Socrates to Sulla*, Boston
- Vermeule,C.C, 1984**, From Halicarnassus to Alexandria in the Hellenistic Age: the Ares of Halicarnassus by Leochares, in, *Alessandria e il Mondo Ellenistico-Romano*, Rome,
- Vermeule,C.C., 1987**, *The cult images of Imperial Rome*, Rome

- Vita.A.Di., 1955**, L'Afrodite Pudica da Punta della Sabbie ed il tipo della Pudica drappeggiata, in, Arch Class 7, 9-24
- Walbank,F.W., 1981**, The Hellenistic World, London
- Walbank,F.W., 1984**, Cambridge Ancient History VII, Cambridge
- Waldstein,C., 1926**, Alcamenes, Cambridge
- Walter,O., 1919**, Ein Kolossalkopf des Zeus aus Aegira, in, ÖjH 19-20, 1-30
- Waywell,G., 1973**, in Coldstream,N., Knossos - the Sanctuary of Demeter, Oxford, 93-5
- Waywell,G., 1978**, The Free-standing Sculptures of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, London
- Wiegand,T., and Schrader,H., 1904**, Priene, Berlin
- Williams,C.K., 1986**, Corinth and the cult of Aphrodite, in, Corinthiaca, studies in honour of D.A.Amyx, Columbia, 12-24
- Winter,F., 1908**, Altertümer von Pergamon 7, Berlin
- Wolters,P., 1892**, Darstellungen des Asklepios, in, AM 17, 1-15
- Yonah,A., 1978**, Hellenism and the east, Jerusalem

APPENDIX

LIST OF INSCRIPTIONS

* An asterisk in the text denotes that the inscription is listed in Appendix

- P.33 Kern,O, 1900, Die Inschriften Von Magnesia am Maeander, number 98.
- P.55 Ippel,A, 1912,6,283.
- P.62 Durrbach and Roussel, Inscriptions de Délos, 1935, number 1442.
- P.71 I.G., XI,4,514
- P.72 Etienne and Braun, 1986,105, number 168, IG,IX,I,97.
- P.81 See Collignon, 1889, 500, number 2.
- P.99 See Durrbach and Roussel, Inscriptions de Délos, 1935, number 1417.
- P.106 Hepding, 1910, AM, 35, 437-8.
Hepding, 1910, AM, 35, 439-442.
- P.114 I.G., V,I, 1443.
Orlando, K, 1972, in Praktika, 137 -138.
- P.115 Leonardos, B.I., in Arch Ephem 1895, 263.
1896, 101, 217.
1890, 249.
- P.157 British Museum, Sculpture 809, CIG, XII, III, 1086.
British Museum Inscriptions, CCCLXV.
- P.161 Marcadé, 1957, II, 102-103.
- P.180 Xenophilos in Marcadé, 1957, I, 109; Stratos, I, 110-111.
- P.182 Pheneos Inscription, see Protonariou-Deliaké, E, 1961, 58.
- P.200 Thrasykles, son of Thrasyllus, I.G., II², 3083.

- P.204 See Hermann, P, "Antiochos der Grosse and Teos", in *Anatolia* 9, 1965, 29-159.
- P.246 See Robert, L, *Les Fouilles de Claros*, 1954, 219.
- P.259 See *Inscriptiones Creticae* IV, 1950, 250, number 179.
- P.277 For Aphrodite at Delos, *I.G.*, XI, 4, number 1277 and 1278.
- P.278 For inscriptions concerned with the worship of Aphrodite at Delos, see Bruneau, 1970, 236.
- P.294 See Pandermalis, 1981, 62-3.
- P.304 See *AvP* II, 43-44.
- P.309 See Carter, 1983, 251-254.
- P.324 See Löwy, 1935, 167, number 228.

