Praxias

Author(s): E. Douglas Van Buren

Source: *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. 3 (1919), pp. 91-100

Published by: [University of Michigan Press](http://www.press.umich.edu) for the [American Academy in Rome](http://www.press.umich.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4238514>

Accessed: 18-02-2016 22:41 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Academy in Rome and *University of Michigan Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

PRAXIAS.

E. DOUGLAS VAN BUREN.

(PLATES 72—75)

" In the pediment are represented Artemis, Leto, Apollo and the Muses, the setting Sun, Dionysos and the Thyiades; the earliest of the figures were made by Praxias of Athens, a pupil of Kalamis; but as a considerable time elapsed during the construction of the temple, Praxias, as his destiny was, succumbed to fate, and the remainder of the pediment sculptures were executed by Androstenes, also an Athenian by birth, but a pupil of Eukadmos " ¹. That is all we are told of the sculptors to whom was consigned the important task of adorning the temple at Delphi when it was rebuilt after its destruction in the early part of the fourth century B. C., for the French excavations have proved that the sculptured groups described in *Ion* v. 184-217 belonged to the earlier, Alkmaionid temple ², destroyed by earthquake or subsidence of the soil ³.

Although commenced about 371 B. C. the work progressed very slowly, since in the Hymn to Dionysos which was found at Delphi and is dated about 338 B. C. " the God bids the Amphiktions complete the work with all speed " ⁴. Evidence seems to show that the Eastern pediment was finished before the Western one; but even so, it can hardly have been put in place before 346 B. C. Every trace of these pediment sculptures has so completely vanished, that the only reasonable hypothesis seems that the groups were removed bodily, probably to Constantinople, to adorn some other building ⁵.

Praxias is known to us from three inscriptions: the first, from Athens, is the dedication by twenty-four men of a statue of Aphrodite, and other references to the names

¹ PAUS., X, 19, 3.

² HOMOLLE, *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, XXV (1901), pp. 457 ff.; XXVI (1902), pp. 587 ff.

³ M. F. COURBY, *Fouilles de Delphes*, II (1915), p. 113; E. BOURGUET, *Les Ruines de Delphes* (1914),

p. 183, Fig. 61.

⁴ *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, XIX (1895), pp. 393-418.

⁵ PERROT, *Hist. de l'Art*, VIII, p. 567; E. REISCH, *Oesterr. Jahresh.*, IX (1906), p. 202.

of these dedicants show that the inscription must be dated between 370 and 360 B. C. ¹. According to an inscription on a base from Oropos, Praxias was the sculptor of a portrait statue of Neoptolemos, the son of Stratokles, dedicated by his son Charias some time between 366 and 338 B. C. ². The third inscription must also be placed about 360 B. C., for it occurs on a base in Delos of a statue of Artemis, dedicated by Archippe, wife of Ikarios ³. A reference to the work of his youth is found in the accounts for the work done on the Erechtheum for the year 407 B. C.: Πραχ[σίας] ἐμ Μελίτη οἰκῶν τὸν [ἵππο]ν καὶ τὸν ὀπισθοφανῆ τ[ὸν πα]ρακρούοντα ΗΔΔ. ⁴.

Therefore in the first half of the fourth century Praxias was at work; but how is this to be reconciled with Pausanias' statement that he was a pupil of Kalamis, whose greatest activity lay between 466 and 430 B. C. ⁵. A sculptor who lived and worked until 340 B. C. (since we are told he died before the completion of the temple), could not have studied under a master who lived a hundred years earlier. Yet it is difficult to believe Pausanias gave wrong information about a temple which was well known and where local tradition was strong. Several theories have been proposed to explain this problem; as, for instance, that Pausanias confused the sculptor of the Delphic pediment with an earlier Praxias, the veritable pupil of Kalamis ⁶; or that there was a second, later Kalamis who worked in the fourth century ⁷. A duplication of well-known artists is an unsatisfactory way of solving chronological puzzles: more credible is the suggestion of M. Homolle that the scribe was at fault in copying the manuscript, and substituted μαθητῆς Καλάμιδος for the less well-known name of Kallimachos ⁸.

Having launched his suggestion M. Homolle went no further, but the theory deserves to be pushed to its logical conclusion, since the reference to Kalamis is chronologically impossible. Kallimachos, an artist renowned for the meticulous precision of his work, for his delicacy and grace ⁹, made for the Goddess a golden lamp which hung in the Erechtheum, and for which a bronze palm served as a chimney ¹⁰. Other works of his were a seated statue of Hera called "the Bride" in her temple at Plataea ¹¹, and "a group of Spartan girls dancing, a work of faultless technique, which has, however, lost all charm by over-elaboration" ¹²; furthermore, a pretty story credits him with the invention of the Corinthian capital ¹³. He was, apparently, a younger contemporary of

¹ I. G., II, 3, 1208.

² I. G., VII, 430.

³ *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, XV, p. 118. For a discussion of these dates see: E. REISCH, *Oesterr. Jahresh.*, IX (1906), pp. 204 f.

⁴ I. G., I, 324, c. A somewhat hazardous restoration of I. G., I, 324, d, gives: Πραξίας ἐμ Με]λίτη [οἰκῶν τὸν νεανίσκον] τὸν τοῦς....

⁵ STUDNICZKA, *Kalamis* (1907), p. 80.

⁶ FRAZER, *Comm. Paus.*, X, 19, 4.

⁷ E. REISCH, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

⁸ *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, XXVI (1902), pp. 634 ff.

⁹ VITRUVIUS, IV, 1, 10; PLINY, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXIV, 92; DION. HAL., *de Isocr.*, p. 52 R.

¹⁰ PAUS., I, 26, 6.

¹¹ PAUS., IX, 2, 7.

¹² PLINY, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXIV, 92.

¹³ VITRUVIUS, IV, 1, 10.

Kalamis, with whom his name is coupled by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and he worked at the end of the fifth century, for the statue of Hera was dedicated about 425 B. C. ¹, and the golden lamp cannot have been placed in the Erechtheum before the completion of the sanctuary in 408 B. C. Evidently he was a skilful worker in metal, but his desire for precision and perfection of detail resulted in over-elaboration and a stilted conventionality, characteristics which we should bear in mind when trying to rediscover his work, a necessary preliminary to the study of his pupil Praxias who, the accounts of the Erechtheum show us, first attracted notice as one of the many young artists engaged on the decoration of that great sanctuary.

Numerous authorities have sought to prove that the Column of the Dancers at Delphi was identical with the *Saltantes Lacaenae* of Kallimachos, but M. Homolle believes it to be a copy of the noted Caryatides of Praxiteles — a copy set up by Asinius Pollio when he carried off the original to Rome ². The maidens certainly appear too natural and vivacious to suit the academic style of Kallimachos, whose rigid adherence to the archaic tradition precluded any lifelike and exuberant motion.

There is, however, a relief which answers better to what we believe his style must have been — a relief, moreover, inscribed ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ (Pl. 72, Fig. 1) ³. On it is depicted Pan advancing towards the right followed by three nymphs in the processional scheme beloved of archaic art. The nymphs advance daintily, each carefully holding a fruit or other small object and wearing elegant garments the edges of which fall into elaborate swallow-tail folds. Many doubts have been expressed as to the authenticity of the inscription; but it seems to be contemporaneous with the relief, which must be considered a Neo-Attic copy of a genuine work of Kallimachos. A cast in Bonn from an unknown original gives an almost exact replica of the third nymph of the Capitoline relief, except that in this case she holds a cornucopiae in her left hand, and must therefore typify Tyche ⁴.

Evidently his style was such that it could easily be adopted for ornamental objects, altars, candelabra, bases — combined and completed by rich floral motives which his toreutic skill had enabled him to bring to perfection in the bronze palm tree and the Corinthian capital. Another work which has been attributed to him is the altar found on the Athenian Acropolis of the Four Gods, Athena, Hephaistos, Hermes and Zeus ⁵. The goddess stands with her feet firmly planted on the ground, in her right hand her lance and in her left her helmet with a plume which terminates in a conventional spiral.

¹ H. S. WASHINGTON, *A. J. A.*, 1891, pp. 390 ff.

² TH. HOMOLLE, *Rev. Archéol.*, V (1917), pp. 1-67.

³ STUART JONES, *Cat. Capitoline Mus.*, I, Pl. 61, pp. 264 f.

⁴ HAUSER, *Die Neu-Attischen Reliefs* (1889), p. 59, No. 81.

⁵ FURTWAENGLER, *Masterpieces*, p. 439; *Mon. dell'Inst.*, VI, Pl. 45; HAUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 34, No. 43 a.

The swallow-tail folds of her drapery are strongly accentuated, a detail even more marked in the case of Hephaistos. The other two figures are partially obliterated, but there are still traces of a beautiful Lesbian kyma which ran round below the figures. These deities are well poised and well developed, and their archaism is less an actual fact than a voluntary self-limitation to an earlier tradition, a dangerous example which, in the hands of less able pupils, developed into mechanical conventionality.

For these figures are the prototypes of a whole series of models, taken over by the Neo-Attic School, adapted for decorative purposes, and copied and recopied until they became mere meaningless stock figures, devoid of any grace or charm. Hauser, in his important book, *Die Neu-Attischen Reliefs* (1889), has enumerated all the examples of the Neo-Attic School, and arranged them into earlier and later groups. He considers that most of the types go back to earlier originals, but by dint of study we can go even further and show their derivation from certain definite masters of the transitional period, foremost of whom was Kallimachos.

The important monument known from its provenance as the Corinthian Puteal was brought to England about 1819, but all trace of it was lost at some period before 1865. Its date is a much debated subject¹. Furtwaengler ascribes it to Kallimachos or his circle², whilst Hauser considers it archaistic and dates it at about 350 B. C.³. It has been suggested that the original was the silver altar in the Heraion depicting the marriage of Hebe and Herakles, but as the puteal itself has disappeared it is hard to determine the date from possibly inaccurate drawings. Here, however, the bas-relief from Kertch, now in the Odessa Museum, comes to our aid, for although incomplete and damaged, it is unrestored and the photograph gives a good idea of its actual condition. M. S. Reinach, in his able discussion of the monument⁴ (Pl. 73, Fig. 2), convincingly proves that it cannot be of Roman workmanship, and that the details which Hauser terms "late", — the swallow-tail folds and the recurved wings on Hermes' bare ankles — are found in genuine archaic works. He maintains that it is Attico-Ionic work of about 470 B. C. But the bodies, especially that of "Peitho", appear too well modelled for such an early period, and he himself mentions that the ivory plaque from Koul-Oba, which he cites as exemplifying the use of swallow-tail edges to drapery and recurved wings on unshod feet, may be dated fairly exactly about 430 B. C. It is probable, therefore, that the original was by Kallimachos, possibly a round base or puteal, sculptured about 430-400 B. C., or even that the silver altar itself was his work, for such an object would be well within the range of the skilful metal-worker. The figure of Hermes should be compared with the Pan of the Kallimachos relief; the attitude is identical, but in the

¹ MICHAELIS, *J. H. S.*, VI (1885), pp. 46 ff.

² *Masterpieces*, p. 441.

³ *Die Neu-Attischen Reliefs*, p. 162.

⁴ *Mon. Piot*, II (1895), pp. 57 ff., Pl. 7.

latter case the copyist has emphasised the muscles and softened the archaic rigidity of pose.

The Kertch relief must be a good copy, perhaps almost contemporaneous, whereas the Corinthian Puteal is the rather freer rendering of a later copyist.

Akin to these deities is the goddess depicted on the short side of a strange monument from Epidauros¹ who pours wine from an oinochoe in her raised right hand. Her long chiton is covered by an over-mantle which falls in elaborate swallow-tail folds; she wears a *stephane* and three long curls hang down on to her breast on either side. M. Svoronos has pointed out the resemblance to the Hebe of the Corinthian Puteal, and further shows that the monument was the work of some Hellenistic artist who was strongly influenced by Phidias, Praxiteles and Paionios in portraying the three other figures of the relief, and so produced a work where models from different epochs were set in juxtaposition. Besides those great masters of the finest period, this adapter evidently drew inspiration from the old-world types of Kallimachos, and testified his admiration by introducing one of his creations among models derived from the work of more progressive artists.

The Hermes and Athena of the Acropolis altar are reproduced on an oblong relief in the Villa Albani² (Pl. 74); but here Athena holds her lance in rest and follows Hermes who moves towards a small square altar on which are leaping flames. Behind Athena comes Apollo, his hair bound with a laurel wreath, and holding his bow and arrow. A small scarf floats from his arms in quite impossible swallow-tail folds. Lastly Artemis advances, her bow and quiver on her shoulder, holding a great torch in her right hand and raising her garment daintily with her left. All four divinities walk rapidly forward with their heels raised from the ground, and each holding their implement with the thumb and first finger only, whilst the other three fingers are extended straight out. This was evidently considered the height of elegance in Kallimachos' day, for Xenophon, a contemporary (circa 429-367 B. C.), describing the banquet of the Median King, writes: "Now the cupbearers of those kings perform their office with fine airs; they pour in the wine with neatness and then present the goblet, conveying it with three fingers, and offer it in such a way as to place it most conveniently in the grasp of the one who is to drink"³.

The two last deities are shown on a fragmentary relief from Smyrna now in the Berlin Museum⁴, good, careful work where the figures walk firmly on the soles of their feet. These two gods with the addition of Hermes and the altar reappear on a round

¹ J. N. SVORONOS, *Athener Nat. Mus.*, II, pp. 418 ff., No. 1425; Pls. 68, 126.

² ZOEGA, *B. R.*, II, Pl. 100; HAUSER, *op. cit.*,

p. 34, No. 43.

³ *Cyropaedia*, I, iii, 8, tr. W. Miller, Loeb Library.

⁴ *Berlin Cat.* No. 893; HAUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 34, No. 42.

base in the Capitoline Museum ¹, but it has been much worked over and the accuracy of detail is lost. Better in that respect, although much effaced, is a fragment in the Archaeological Museum of Milan ² where only Athena and Hermes are preserved, and these two deities with Artemis are portrayed on the relief in the Hermitage ³. Perhaps the best example, however, is a round base in the Torlonia Collection ⁴ (Pl. 72, Fig. 2) with Zeus, Athena and another goddess in chiton and overmantle who holds a sceptre, probably Hera. Very fragmentary is the relief of Athena and a god walking to left in the Museo Chiaramonti ⁵, and also Athena alone in the Capitoline Museum ⁶.

Interesting in this connection is the damaged slab found on the Athenian Acropolis and published by Ada von Natoliczka ⁷, where on one side appears Athena, who, save for the addition of great wings, a very unusual feature, is an evident copy of the Athena of the Altar of the Four Gods. The details lack the crispness of the original, and the more modern rendering of the aegis and shoulders seems to indicate that the model was already blurred when the copy was made. But the chief value of the slab, as the author points out, is that it proves "that we must seek the prototypes of Neo-Attic art above all in Athens". Furthermore, the slab is important on account of the second side, where, in very high relief, Athena steps forward, raising her robe with her left hand, for here is an indication of the figures in the round of this School. This Athena reveals the source of inspiration of such statues as the Artemis from Pompeii ⁸ and the Herculaneum Athena ⁹.

These types with certain modifications are found again on a base round which the gods walk in procession ¹⁰ (Pl. 72, Fig. 3). Here Athena holds her lance upright as on the Acropolis altar, but Apollo, instead of his bow and arrow, holds the kithara. Between them is Herakles with bow and club, the lion's skin covering his head and knotted on his chest; the lion's tail terminates in the same conventional spiral as the plume of Athena's helmet; the garments fall into swallow-tail folds, but the gods walk firmly on their feet and their gait is dignified and well balanced, showing that the work is a faithful copy of a good early model. Yet the change in Apollo's attitude and the

¹ STUART JONES, *Cat.*, Salone 1a, Pl. 65; HAUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 34, No. 41.

² ESPÉRANDIEU, *Mon. Ant. figurés du Mus. Archéol. de Milan*, I, p. 11, Fig. 3.

³ L. R. FARNELL, *J. H. S.*, IX (1888), p. 39; S. REINACH, *Rep. Reliefs*, III, p. 490; C. GEDEONOV, *Mus. of Ancient Sculpture*, (Petrograd, 1911), No. 330.

⁴ VISCONTI, *Cat. Torlonia* (1883), No. 501; HAUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 35, No. 44.

⁵ AMELUNG, *Vatican Cat.*, I, Pl. 32, No. 10; HAUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 61, No. 87.

⁶ MATZ-V. DUHN, No. 3641.

⁷ *Oesterr. Jahrb.*, xvii (1914), pp. 121-132, Pl. 1.

⁸ BRUNN-BRUCKMANN, Pl. 356.

⁹ Naples Museum, No. 6007. COMPARETTI e DE PETRA, *La Villa Ercolanese dei Pisoni* (1883), Pl. xix, No. 1.

¹⁰ Owing to cleaning and restoration this base has lost much of what little grace and precision the Roman copyist was able to reproduce. Nevertheless these divinities have a certain affinity with those of the Corinthian Puteal where, also, the gods are nude, and the Hera of the base closely resembles the goddess who precedes Hermes on the earlier work. Roccheggiani has reversed the design, and Moses follows him in this, and furthermore bestows a beard upon Herakles! ROCCHEGGIANI, *Raccolta di Cento Tavole*, Pl. 100; MOSES, *Vases, Altars etc.*, Pl. 146; STUART JONES, *Cat. Capitoline Museum*, Pl. 29, p. 106.

introduction of Herakles lead us into a new series of monuments, closely connected with, but more advanced than the work of Kallimachos.

For both Apollo, without the kithara, and Herakles just as he is represented on the base, appear again in the group of monuments illustrating the Theft of the Tripod¹, in which Herakles bears off the tripod which Apollo seizes with his right hand in the hope of retaining his property. One of the best known examples of the subject is the Dresden Base², where all the characteristics previously noted are strongly marked, but the copyist has exaggerated the peculiarities of treatment; the flesh is rendered with extreme softness, the figures advance on tip-toe, and the details are so stylised that they form merely a pleasing decorative motive. The other sides depict a Dionysiac subject; in one instance a priest and priestess adorn the tripod with sacred fillets; in the other the priestess is engaged in the same action while Dionysos looks on. This Dionysos is obviously derived from the Zeus of the Torlonia base, the same pose with the weight resting on the left leg, the same enveloping mantle, drawn tightly round the outline of the limbs by the bent arm resting on the left hip. The sceptre has been transformed into a thyrsos, and the simple dignity of the earlier type has developed into the statuesque pose of the later creation. Statuesque, indeed, the Dionysos certainly is, for the treatment of the drapery recalls the Dionysos Sardanapalos, and the motive of the clinging drapery was afterwards reproduced with fine effect in the Sophocles of the Lateran³.

A link between the earlier monuments and the Dresden Base is formed by a series of reliefs portraying Dionysos. The best and earliest of these is the fragment of a vase in the Museo Barracco⁴ where the figure is preserved down to the knees only, but the work is excellent, the details sharply marked. The god, in a χειρὶδωτὸς χιτῶν, with a peplos fastened on the right shoulder, moves towards the left, carrying his thyrsos in his left hand. More complete is the triangular base from Praeneste⁵, for the god walks firmly on the soles of his feet, and moreover the ornamentation is very near to the Dresden Base, for here we have winged figures at the angles with rosettes filling the spaces under their curved wings. The fragment in the Collection Duval in Morillon⁶ again shows the upper half only, whilst that from Tralles⁷ gives the lower half. In all these examples the swallow-tail folds, the mantle drawn tightly round the lower limbs and the treatment of the hair recall the earlier works. Furtwaengler saw in the Dresden Base a copy after

¹ STEPHANI, C. R., 1868, p. 47, Nos. 78-84, enumerates the examples.

² BRUNN-BRUCKMANN, *Denkmäler*, Pl. 150.

³ ARNDT-BRUCKMANN, *Gr. u. Röm. Porträts*, Pl. 113.

⁴ *Röm. Inst.*, No. 4780; BIEBER, *Jahrb. d. Inst.*, xxxii (1917), p. 22, Fig. 2.

⁵ MATZ-V. DUHN, No. 3662; HAUSER, *op. cit.*, p.

35, No. 47; BIEBER, *op. cit.*, p. 23, Fig. 3.

⁶ *B. S. A.*, iii (1896/7), p. 158, Pl. xii, b; *Arch. Anz.*, X (1895), p. 53, Fig. 10.

⁷ *B. S. A.*, iii, Pl. xii, a; JOUBIN, *Cat. des Sculpt. du Musée Impérial Ottoman* (Constantinople, 1893), pp. 62 f., No. 143; MENDEL, *Musées Impériaux Ottomans, Cat. d. Sculptures*, ii (Constantinople, 1914), No. 460.

Kallimachos¹, and points out that the rich ornamentation of floral motives and Seilenoi stands in close relation to the Erechtheum and is suggestive of the designer of the palm tree and the Corinthian capital. This is true; nevertheless, the composition, although eclectic, is too free to be the work of the *Katatexitēchnos*, and should be attributed to his pupil Praxias. There is a certain *élan* of movement which sweeps us on, away from the dignified processions of Kallimachos to a larger conception and outlook.

This greater breadth of treatment is more marked in the series of reliefs representing Apollo receiving a libation from a winged Nike while Artemis and Leto follow in his rear. Both goddesses closely resemble the nymphs in the relief of Pan and the Nymphs, with only a slight modification of the exaggerated swallow-tail folds, and a rounder, truer rendering of the anatomy. Apollo's kithara is identical in type with that of the Kertch relief, but is treated more ornately. Yet the present asymmetrical design must be mutilated, for the Nike should mark the centre of the field, and there ought to be at least three other figures on the right to counterbalance the divinities on the left. The composition is known from three complete examples, in the Villa Albani, in the Louvre and in Berlin² (Pl. 75), and there are many replicas of isolated figures and of late adaptations³.

It was, therefore, a well-known and favorite one and must have been exposed in some much frequented cult site. The scene is depicted as taking place before a low wall, flanked on the left by a high pilaster surmounted by a tripod; on the right, by a column bearing an athlete's statue. In two examples a plane tree grows just beyond the wall, and in all three reliefs a temple with Corinthian columns rises on the left, the architrave adorned with two tritons holding a shield with a gorgoneion. The composition is complete without the addition of the temple, which has been added by the copyist to identify the locality⁴. But why should the divinities parade before an earthly temple? Evidently because it was in some way connected with them, or else contained the original from which these reliefs are derived. Here the plane tree assists in the identification⁵, for it shows that Delphi, the great sanctuary of Apollo, is intended, and that here is the temple as known to the Neo-Attic copyist, schematised as on the coins⁶, with many

¹ *Masterpieces*, p. 441.

² SCHREIBER, *Hellenistische Reliefbilder*, Pls. 34-36.

³ REINACH, *Rep. Stat.*, I, p. 21; *Berlin Cat. Sculp.*, No. 922; DÜTSCHKE, *Oberit.*, II, No. 472; CHASE, *Cat. Arretine Pottery* (Boston, 1916), pp. 28 ff., Pls. III, IV, XXIX; FURTWAENGLER, *Ant. Gemmen*, Pl. LXV, No. 51; ivory relief, Ashmolean Museum, reproduced on our Pl. 73, Fig. 1.

⁴ The terracotta slabs which always reproduce the scene without the addition of the background are probably copied directly from the original instead of being a simplification of the marble reliefs. It is possible that the latter were adapted to serve as offerings by the

winners in musical contests rather than that the original work was designed for that purpose as suggested by Reisch (*Weihgeschenke*, pp. 24-27). VON ROHDEN, *Architektonische röm. Tonreliefs*, Pl. CXI, 2, 3, pp. 17 f.

⁵ PLINY, *Nat. Hist.*, XVI, 88; THEOPHRASTUS, *Hist. Plant.*, IV, 13; BOETTICHER, *Baumkultus*, p. 132.

⁶ GARDNER, *J. H. S.*, VIII (1887), Pl. 74. x, 22-25. The artists have allowed themselves great latitude: on one coin the six-column temple appears as tetrastyle; the columns are now Ionic, now Corinthian, and the pediment shows many variations. The only example which really attempts to reproduce it exactly shows a group of large figures which cannot be further identified.

details eliminated and only a few salient features, such as the Corinthian columns, retained.

Hence we may conclude that the main composition was the work of Praxias, a work localised at Delphi, connected with the sanctuary and depicting the Delphic Apollo himself. In a word, this composition fulfils Pausanias' description of the Eastern pediment: "Artemis, Leto, Apollo and the Muses".

Probably the lost Muses resembled some such scheme as the three nymphs joining hands of the Corinthian Puteal, for the "Peitho" of the Kertch relief is the graceful female counterpart of the Dionysos of the Dresden Base.

The Western pediment is more difficult to recover, but the setting Sun in one angle must have been balanced by the rising Selene in the other, with the group of Dionysos and the Thyiades in the centre. Thus in a prominent position the two great Delphic cults were represented: Apollo, the vanquisher of the Python, and Dionysos, who reigned alone at the shrine during the three months that Apollo was absent among the Hyperboreans.

Some archaeologists have been perplexed to find the Dionysos of the Dresden Base and other types taken haphazard from the works we have attributed to Kallimachos introduced among other figures from an obviously later cycle as decorative motives on works of late date such as the amphora in Naples or the vase of Sosibios in the Louvre¹. Winter endeavours to prove that the original of the orgiastic maenad with the slaughtered victim, who is shown on this vase and is best known from the relief in the Conservatori Museum, was a work by a master of the end of the fifth century, probably Kallimachos². But such violence accords ill with the character of the sculptor as recorded by ancient writers, and recalls rather the art of Skopas. Pausanias mentions that Praxias died before the completion of the temple and that the work was finished by Androstenes. Now this otherwise unknown Androstenes was a contemporary of Skopas, and quite possibly was strongly influenced by that great master. What more probable than that in the Western pediment confided to his charge he introduced certain types borrowed from the cycle of Skopas, and at the same time, in order to bring his work into harmony with the earlier pediment of Praxias, he retained other figures, well-known in the series belonging to Praxias and his master Kallimachos? This would account for the apparent incongruity of choice of the Neo-Attic masters, because they did not commit the solecism of taking models from various cycles, but selected at random from either the East or West pediment. Furthermore they exaggerated the defects of the earlier art and failed

¹ *Mus. Borbonico*, VII, Pl. 9; HAUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 39, No. 55 and pp. 7 f., No. 1.

² F. WINTER, *Ueber ein Vorbild Neu-Attischer*

Reliefs in 50tes Winckelmanns-progr., Berlin (1890), pp. 97 ff., 3 Pls.

to portray its stately rhythm, thus producing such works as the square base in the Museo Chiaramonti ¹, or the relief which caricatures the Villa Albani slab ².

Kallimachos has been proposed as the creator of the original relief showing dancers crowned with the *kalathiskos*, known from many copies ³. In the earliest and best examples ⁴, these maidens certainly resemble the Nike of the Kitharoidos reliefs in their rhythm and poise, but that would assign them to Praxias rather than to his master whose *Saltantes Lacaeanae* must have trod a far more solemn and dignified measure.

The Altar of the Twelve Gods in the Louvre ⁵ derives from a different series of models; the figures, which are squarely built and stand firmly on their feet, are presented frontally instead of in profile after the invariable habit of Kallimachos. An original work of this other school is the fragment of a God (Zeus?) in the Athens Museum ⁶ where the folds are treated as a series of thick pleats as exemplified by the drapery of the Seasons, the Eileithyiai and Hephaistos of the Louvre altar.

I have sought to prove in this short article that only by studying the works of his master can we arrive at a knowledge of the style of Praxias, and, moreover, that such a study reveals the fact that in the series of reliefs known as the Kitharoidos reliefs we have a mutilated version of the West pediment of the Delphic sanctuary, the chief and final work of Praxias. After his death the East pediment was finished by Androstenes, who combined certain types taken from his predecessor's cycle with other types from his great contemporary Skopas. The art of Kallimachos and his followers became the stock models of the Neo-Attic school, who conventionalised and exaggerated their patterns until they lost all the delicacy and grace for which the originals were justly famed.

December 1918.

¹ AMELUNG, *Kat.*, I, Pl. 45, No. 182.

² WINCKELMANN, *Opere*, Pl. 85.

³ ZOEGA, *B. R.*, I, Pls. 20 and 21; CLARAC, *Musée*, II, Pls. 167 and 168; MOSES, *Vases, Altars etc.*, Pl. 60; CHASE, *Cat. Arretine Pottery*, (Boston, 1916), pp. 53 ff., Pls. X, XI; Loeb *Coll. of Arretine Pottery*, (New York,

1908), Pls. III, XVI.

⁴ KEKULÉ V. STRADONITZ, *Die Gr. Skulpt.* (1907), pp. 139 ff.

⁵ CLARAC, *Musée*, Pls. 173 and 174.

⁶ SVORONOS, *Athener Nat. Mus.*, Pl. 21, No. 95, p. 101.

1

1, Relief by Kallimachos, Capitoline Museum.

2

2, Base in Torlonia Collection, Rome.

3

3, Base in Capitoline Museum.

1

2

1, Ivory relief, Ashmolean Museum. 2, Bas-relief from Kertch, Odessa Museum.

Relief in Villa Albani, Rome.

Relief, Berlin.