FEMALE FIGURE OF PHEIDIAN STYLE.

HEAD OF FEMALE FIGURE OF PHEIDIAN STYLE.

THE OXFORD BUST.

A FEMALE FIGURE IN THE EARLY STYLE OF PHEIDIAS.

[PLATES I.-III.]

I.

I HAVE to bring before the readers of this *Journal* a female figure of great interest recently added to the Ashmolean Gallery of Sculpture. Its beauty and dignity will be evident to all who look at the plates (Pls. I., II.). In addition to its beauty it has also special interest, because a discussion of it necessarily involves the whole question of Attic art in the age of Pericles, and particularly of portrait sculpture in that age.

The figure comes from the Hope Collection at Deepdene in Surrey, which was sold by auction in July last. It lay unnoticed in the Deepdene mansion, and was not seen by Michaelis when he visited it in 1877, nor by more recent visitors. I have not succeeded in finding any information as to its source; but as many of the Hope sculptures were found in Rome, it is very probable that this comes thence. The restorations are in Italian marble, and were probably executed in Rome. It is wrongly described, and not figured, in the Hope Sale Catalogue.

The height is 6 feet (m. 1.83); the height of the face (chin to roots of hair, is 7 inches (m. .18); the breadth of the shoulders is 1 foot 6 inches (m. .46). The figure and head are of Pentelic marble. On this point I am supported by Mr. W. Pinker, head mason at the British Museum, who has had rare opportunities for studying that material.

The body is sculptured in a hard block of Pentelic marble, which seems almost impervious to the action of time and weather, and preserves all details. The restorations are: both forearms from the elbow, and a few patches in the ridges of drapery on the front. Both forearms were originally made of separate blocks, and fresh blocks have been inserted in the vacant holes. The restorer has placed in the left hand a scroll, evidently regarding the lady as a poetess, probably as Sappho. The right hand was so badly restored as to be intolerable, and I was obliged to amputate it.

The right foot, which is very delicately carved, is partly visible (Fig. 1). The dress consists of an Ionic chiton, of which only the sleeves with lines of

fibulæ on the upper arms are visible, and over this the heavy woollen Dorian garment commonly called the Dorian chiton but more correctly the Dorian peplos. The peplos of our figure is fastened on both shoulders, but the brooches by which it is fastened are not visible. The peplos is not, as in some cases, open at the side, but forms at the sides two false sleeves.

The lower part of the neck is a restoration. Of the head, the nose and a small part of the upper lip are also restored. The upper part of the right ear is broken away; the left ear, which is beautifully modelled, is complete. The lips are slightly parted.

The proportions are noteworthy. The shoulder breadth, so far as it can be measured through the dress, is one fourth of the height. The length of

FIG. 1.—RIGHT FOOT OF THE OXFORD STATUE.

the face is one tenth of the height. The build is very solid and dignified; but the hips, as in all statues of the period, are somewhat narrow.

The head and the body belong to one another. At first sight I doubted this, as the head has suffered far more than the body from weathering, especially on the top. It seems to be of a softer block of marble, but style and period correspond. There is however more definite proof at p. 102 of Furtwängler's *Masterpieces* (Eng. trans. p. 70). There will be found a poor engraving of a statue, formerly in the Cepparelli Gallery at Florence,¹ now

¹ Dütschke, *Bildwerke in Nord-Italien*, ii. No. 413.

in the Museo Archeologico, of which both head and body nearly resemble our statue, though they are rather later in style. The head, it is true, is—like that of our statue—inserted with a modern neck. But both Dütschke and Milani are convinced that it belongs to the body; and when Furtwängler expresses a doubt on this subject, he gives no reasons for scepticism. Now it might have been possible to doubt the belonging, either of our head or of that of Florence, if either figure were unique, but that twice over a head of a special type (of which but two are known) should have been arbitrarily joined to a body of almost exactly the same style and date passes all limits of probability. To the Florence statue I return later. (See Fig. 2.)

Though the provenience of our statue is uncertain, any one with trained eyes who considered it carefully could scarcely doubt that it was a fifth-century original. The delicate way in which the ends of the garment are treated, the admirable modelling of the shoulders at the back and the breasts, the beautiful work of the foot, make this clear. Copies of the Hellenistic age are mostly exaggerated and fanciful, those of the Roman age mechanical and unintelligent; but here we have a figure perfectly self-consistent, combining in the highest degree simplicity and elegance; every detail, even of the back, finished with perfect care.

If our statue, for example, be compared with a copy of a draped statue of the fifth century from the Library of King Juba II. of Mauritania, now in the Museum of Cherchel,² which is no doubt the work of a copyist of Roman times, the contrast will be striking. Here the drapery is dry and undecided, the nude under it is imperfectly rendered, the proportions are unsatisfactory: on all these points our statue will pass the severest criticism.

No doubt some beautiful statues of the same class found in Rome are by most archaeologists regarded as copies of the Roman Age. Prof. Mariani³ has suggested that they are in some cases copies made by artists of the school of Pasiteles. But the signed works of that school are by no means mere exact copies but transpositions. Of course, if a precise copy of a fifth century work were made at Rome, we could not now detect it. But we have no reason to think that this was usual: Roman copyists were not so exact and conscientious. There is no reason why genuine Greek statues of the early period should not be found in Rome, and in fact many such have been found, especially in the Horti Sallustiani. Such are the fifth century Niobids in the Ny-Carlsberg Gallery, the Hestia Giustiniani, and other figures mentioned below.

II.

I propose to consider in turn the drapery and the head.

The drapery ranges our statue with a large class of figures of the fifth century. These I propose to divide into two groups.

The first group is of female figures clad *only* in the heavy Dorian chiton or peplos. As is generally known, this was a mere square of cloth, doubled

² Gauckler, *Musée de Cherchel*, p. 102, Pl. V.

³ *Bull. Comm.* 1901, p. 79.

back so as to make an overfall to the waist, and generally drawn up through the girdle, so as to form a kolpos. Sometimes one side is left open all the way down: more often it is fastened so as to make on both sides rudimentary or false sleeves. Some of these figures are quite archaic in style. Of those belonging to the middle part of the fifth century, I would specially cite the following:—

Hippodamia in the Olympian pediment.

Female figure in the Ludovisi gallery, headless, of Parian marble.

(Helbig, *Führer*, ii. 1287; Brunn, *Denkmäler*, Pl. 357. Helbig regards it as a Greek original.)

Figure in the Villa Borghese, not unlike the last mentioned.

(Helbig, *Führer*, ii. 1558; Brunn, *Denkmäler*, Pl. 261, 262. Helbig calls it a copy of a bronze statue of Peloponnesian school.)

Figure in the Ny-Carlsberg Gallery, headless.

Catalogue, Pl. 7, 8, p. 13. Arndt considers it a Greek original. A head in plaster is now added.

The Hestia Giustiniani, with veiled head.

A figure in Greek marble, headless, now belonging to Mrs. J. Gardner of Boston. (Mariani in *Bull. Comm. di Roma*, 1901, p. 71, Pl. VI.)

Bronze girls from Herculaneum, the peplos variously arranged.

All of these statues show considerable severity.

In this connexion should be mentioned a very interesting series of statuettes about a metre high, existing in the Doge's palace at Venice, and coming from the Grimani Collection, which was formed in Greece in the sixteenth century. These are described by Furtwängler.⁴ According to him they belong together, and are Greek originals from some temple in the Greek Islands or Asia Minor. They range in date from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the fourth century. The dress in some cases is the Ionian chiton with himation, in some cases the Dorian peplos. Whom do they represent? The view of Furtwängler is that they all represent Demeter or Persephone; and belong to a shrine of those deities; but only one or two have any of the attributes of the goddesses, and it is more probable that most of them represent women. The heads, however, so far as they remain, are not individual, so that we seem in this case to have a continuation of the early custom of dedicating generalized female figures in the temples of the deities. Two points which are common to all these figures, that they are of Parian marble, and that they show no Ionian chiton under the peplos, as well as their small size, make a broad line of distinction between them and our statue. Certainly they are not of Attic school.

Figures of this class, clad only in the peplos, are commonly regarded as Peloponnesian, and, generally speaking, with justice. We know that Dorian girls were thus clad. Thus we are told that Periander of Epidaurus saw Melitta the daughter of Procles clad in the chiton only (*ἀναμπεχονος καὶ*

⁴ *Abhandl. der bayr. Akad. der Wissensch.* vol. xxi. part 2, p. 277.

μονοχίτων),⁵ by which is doubtless meant the peplos. In one of the fragments of Anacreon⁶ we have the phrase ἐκδύσα χιτῶνα δωριάζειν, which shows that the absence of a chiton under the peplos was generally recognised as a distinctively Dorian costume. The peplos served both as the ἔνδυμα or undergarment and the περίβλημα or outer garment.⁷ And this information, derived from ancient writers, is confirmed by existing remains. A number of small bronzes and terracottas of this type have been found in Peloponnesus.⁸ But though most of the statues above mentioned are Peloponnesian, there may be exceptions, since the Dorian dress became quite usual for girls at Athens in the early fifth century. For example, the beautiful Hestia Giustiniani may very well be an Attic original.

But there is a second group, of which the Attic origin is probable. It consists of figures which wear, under the Dorian dress, a fine linen chiton.

The prototype is the archaic dedicated figure in the Acropolis Museum at Athens, which differs from all of the rest of the set in dress, and is one of the earliest. It is well known.⁹ The under chiton is clearly visible on the upper arms. Some other Acropolis figures, of a time before the Persian wars, show the same costume: an Athena (Dickins, *Cat.* No. 140); a Nike (*Cat.* No. 694), etc. Furtwängler insists on the Attic character of these. A few later works in the round with this costume are known, such as the great Medici torso of Athena in Paris, and a statuette in the Ny-Carlsberg Museum 675 mètres high (*Cat.* p. 13), of which the head is supposed to belong, though re-inserted; this figure is of Pentelic marble, and so probably Attic.

Closer to our statue, alike in head and body, is the figure in the Archaeological Museum at Florence already mentioned. The size is given by Dütschke as more than life. Both arms are restorations. Milani in his Guide to the Museum describes the statue. It has been wrongly restored as Demeter, holding ears of corn; Milani regards it as an Aphrodite. He calls it a fine Pheidian type (tipo fidiaco) and says that it is of Pentelic marble. He also figures it (Plate CL, No. 6), but on so small a scale that it cannot be clearly seen. I insert here a cut (Fig. 2) made from a photograph kindly supplied by the Director, Sig. Pernier, through the friendly mediation of Mrs. Strong. It will be seen that though the head apparently closely resembles that of our statue, the style of the body is somewhat later, and the weight rests on the right leg; both feet, clad in shoes, are visible. The Florence figure wears a fine chiton, and over that a doubled Dorian peplos, over which again is a small cloak, falling at the back down to the waist, and drawn forward over both shoulders. It is the same dress, but for the under

⁵ Pythaenetus in Athenaeus, xiii. 56.

⁶ Fragm. 59.

⁷ Pollux, vii. 49.

⁸ See especially *Tiryns*, i. Pl. IX, X; S. Reinach, *Répertoire de la Statuaire*, ii. 643;

J.H.S. xxx. Pl. XIII.

⁹ E. A. Gardner, *Handbook*, p. 170; Collignon, i. p. 341; other references in Dickins, *Cat. Acropolis Museum*, No. 679.

chiton, which is worn by the girls in the Parthenon frieze; and this fact combined with the character of the marble, make clear its Attic origin.¹⁰

FIG. 2.—STATUE IN THE MUSEO ARCHEOLOGICO, FLORENCE.

¹⁰ This figure is not mentioned by Amelung in his *Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz*, (1897).

In the *Bulletino Comunale* for 1897 Mariani publishes several female figures which have some likeness to the Ashmolean statue. The only one of them which calls for more detailed mention is one found in Crete.^{10a} It is of Greek marble, small-grained and like ivory in hue; whence it would seem to be Pentelic. The height is six feet; the figure not only wears the Ionic chiton under the Dorian peplos, but even the folds of the over-garment, the ponderation, and the way in which the right foot comes out, are almost identical with the Ashmolean figure, which however, so far as one may judge from photographs, seems to be much finer in execution. But the remarkable thing is that the head of the Cretan figure which, though reinserted, seems to belong to it, is of quite another type. It is of rather severe features, with the hair in two masses over the temples, and drawn back in a knot at the back. Several heads of the kind are known. Arndt has brought together several of them,^{10b} and expressed the view, which is in fact generally held, that they are of Peloponnesian type. But of this there is no adequate proof. In fact they vary considerably among themselves: and the Cretan head, at all events, has an Attic appearance.

It is well known that, after the Persian wars, there was a great tendency at Athens to abandon Ionian customs, in dress and other matters, and to adopt the Dorian ways. In dress the change was rather gradual. The archaic dedicated figures of the Acropolis nearly all wear the Ionian chiton, and over it a cloak or himation. And most Athenian figures, both in vase painting and sculpture, still wear this dress after the Persian wars. By the time of Praxiteles it had again become usual, though in the fourth century the cloak was far more elaborately arranged. But meantime, during most of the fifth century, the Dorian modes were prevalent. Thus in Attic vase-paintings of the time just after the Persian wars the Dorian peplos is very frequently found on girls, either open or joined, and with or without girdle. But the combination of the Ionic chiton, as an undergarment, with the Doric peplos is a rarer arrangement. It is difficult to trace in red-figure vase-painting, except in the case of Athena. Athena certainly sometimes is thus clad: I would instance the Theseus vase of Euphronius;¹¹ also she is thus clad on the earlier Athenian terracotta, representing the birth of Erichthonius.¹² But though thus infrequent on vases, this particular form of dress is quite Athenian. It is also to be found later on the well-known relief from the later temple at Ephesus, which represents (perhaps) the return of Alcestis from Hades, and in Hellenistic and Roman art.

The marble and the costume thus both indicate Athens as the place of origin of our statue; the next point is the date. This is certainly about the middle of the fifth century. The decisive features are the following:—The upright folds of the drapery, and particularly the folds across the breast, belong to a time shortly before the Parthenos of Pheidias and the Iris of the Parthenon pediment, and a little later than the Sterope of the

^{10a} *Bull. Com.* 1897, Pl. XII.–XIII., p. 170.

^{10b} *La glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg*, p. 49.

¹¹ Furtwängler and Reichhold, Pl. 5.

¹² *Archäol. Zeitung*, 1872, Pl. 63.

Olympia pediment and the bronze charioteer of Delphi. The work of the outer corners of the eyes is a good test of the date of statues. In figures earlier than the middle of the fifth century, such as the sculpture of Olympia, the upper eyelid meets the lower at an angle, but does not overlap it. After the middle of the century it does overlap. We may see the custom coming in in the head of Nemesis by Agoracritus and the sculptures of the Parthenon. One can only cite dated works on such points as these; to cite undated works is useless. And to cite Roman copies is still more futile, for the Roman copyist often alters or transposes such small points of style. In our statue the upper eyelid does not overlap. A survey alike of drapery and head thus justifies one in assigning our statue to B.C. 460-440.

The school must be that of Pheidias, the most noteworthy of the schools of Athens at the period. Though Pheidias's greatest works were in ivory and gold, yet he is said to have also worked in marble, and a statue of Aphrodite of his handiwork, made of Parian marble, was shewn at Elis,¹³ and another in the Gallery of Octavia at Rome.¹⁴ The other noted Athenian school of sculpture at the time was that of Calamis, which was distinctly conservative and Ionic in character. Calamis and his pupils devoted their skill to the perfecting of graceful detail. We are told by Dionysius of Halicarnassus¹⁵ that the school of Calamis was noted for lightness and grace (*λεπτότης καὶ χάρις*) while that of Pheidias aimed at what was dignified and large in style (*τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ μεγαλότεχρον καὶ ἀξιοματικόν*). There can scarcely be a doubt as to which of these tendencies is shown in our statue. A noted feature in the Pheidian school was the adoption of Peloponnesian dress, as is shown by the use of the Dorian peplos in the Pheidian statues of Athena. But sometimes, as in the great Medici statue of Athena—no doubt a somewhat later work of Pheidian type—the finer under-chiton was combined with the peplos. There can thus be little question but that our figure must belong to the Pheidian school. We do not know with certainty when Pheidias began his activity, but he must have been born very early in the fifth century, and as we shall see later he was well established by B.C. 460.

III.

Let us next more carefully examine the head (Pl. II.). I know of only one head of the same type and of so early a period, that of the statue in Florence already mentioned. But parallels of a somewhat later date exist in several museums. Bernoulli has enumerated them;¹⁶ and Furtwängler,¹⁷ S. Reinach,¹⁸ and others have discussed them. They form the group commonly regarded as portraits of Sappho.

The most distinctive feature in the Ashmolean head is the way in which the hair is arranged in the form called a *sphendone*, from its likeness to a

¹³ Paus. i. 14, 7.

¹⁴ Pliny, xxxvi. 15.

¹⁵ *De Isocrate*, ch. 3.

¹⁶ *Griech. Ikonographie*, i. pp. 59-73.

¹⁷ *Meisterwerke*, p. 102; *Masterpieces*, p. 70.

¹⁸ *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, 1902, 2, p. 457.

sling. The band is narrow above the forehead, wider a little higher up, widest at the back of the head, where it forms a sort of bag. Above the middle of the forehead is a fastening in form like an ivy-leaf, and on either side over the temple there is a bunch of hair, while two spiral curls in the form of sea-shells hang on each temple. The *sphendone* is common on the heads of goddesses on the coins of Syracuse¹⁹ and Corinth,²⁰ where it occurs in infinite variety. It occurs often also in Attic sepulchral reliefs. The *sphendone* on the head of Hegeso²¹ is remarkably like that on the present head, and the hair running in parallel waves is adapted to the lines of the fillet in similar fashion in both heads: but in the case of Hegeso the ends of the fillet fall in front of the ears.

The little spiral curls, two on each cheek, are a more notable feature, and may furnish us with a clue. As to their origin, they seem to succeed, and to supersede, the long curls falling over the breast which are usual in archaic art, and so they form a transition to later styles of hair-dressing. In the Chigi Athena at Dresden,²² which may be regarded as in almost all respects a faithful copy of an original of the mid-fifth century, there are still three curls on each shoulder, but they are no longer stiff and formal. In the head of one of the bronze figures of women from Herculaneum, we have three curls on each cheek, but they no longer fall over the breast. Formal curls lingered longer in Asia Minor, as relics of the stately customs of early art. We may judge this from the formal curls on the head of Artemisia from the Mausoleum, and the head from Priene. Traces of the old convention may even be found in the masks of the comic stage. In the dress of the New Comedy at Athens, the mask of the courtesan had curls by the ear (*βοστρύχους ἔχει περὶ τὰ ὦτα*),²³ and her hair was bound about with a taenia (*ταινιδίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν περισφιγμένον*). The particle *περι-* seems to imply something more than one simple band, and would very well apply to such an arrangement as that of our statue. Probably the dress of the stage courtesan was taken from that of some of the noted courtesans of Ionia; and they no doubt followed the highest fashions of their time. Thus, though the *sphendone* in itself is a very ordinary headdress, we may well suppose that when combined with the short curls it was specially appropriate to the attractive women of Ionia.

The attribution of the heads of this type to Sappho is based on grounds which are not very solid. The reason consisted, in fact, in the inscription on a herm in the Palace of the Conservatori at Rome, on which was a head with this kind of headdress,—which inscription is certainly modern.²⁴

The figure of Sappho is found on vases of the red-figured class and on terracottas—Bernoulli has made a list of these representations; and several

¹⁹ For example, Head's *Syracuse* (*Num. Chron.* 1874), Pl. III. 1, V. 1, 2, etc.

²⁰ *Br. Mus. Cat., Corinth*, Pls. V. and X.

²¹ Conze, Pl. XXX. This figure is closely like the Parthenon Frieze.

²² Best published in *J.H.S.* 1912, pp. 43–56; Pl. I.

²³ Pollux, iv. 153.

²⁴ See Bernoulli, *Griech. Ikon.* i. p. 61.

of them are put together by Jahn.²⁵ I do not find in them anything distinctive, or indicating a knowledge of sculptural types. Some of the bronze coins of Mytilene of the Roman imperial class give representations of the head of Sappho and of a seated statue of her. But they are on so small a scale that they give us no testimony of value as regards features, and the hair sometimes is bound with a kerchief, sometimes with a fillet, and sometimes is arranged in a simple knot.

But much more interesting is the head to be found on bronze autonomous coins of Mytilene of about B.C. 300²⁶ (Fig. 3). The little lyre which occupies the reverse of these coins seems to be purposefully contrasted with the large square lyre which occupies the reverse of the coins on the obverse of which Apollo appears. And the notable feature of the two short curls on the cheek of the female head on the obverse seems to indicate an individual, not a deity. Julius Pollux tells us that the people of Mytilene put Sappho on their coins²⁷; and he can scarcely be referring to the coins of the imperial

FIG. 3.—BRONZE COIN OF MYTILENE, ENLARGED.

age, as in the other coin-types which he mentions he must be speaking of the autonomous series. I am therefore disposed to think that on the bronze coins to which I refer the head is that of Sappho, perhaps regarded as one of the Muses, and as the object of a cult.²⁸ These coins, however, being very small and of conventional character, do not help us to recover the actual traits of the poetess, or rather of her accepted art-type, for considering the period of Sappho, there could not exist any naturalistic portrait of her. Later sculptors who portrayed her, such as Silanion, who was a contemporary of Plato, must have created a conventional art-type of Sappho, just as they did of Homer.

We must examine the whole class of sculptured heads called 'Sappho.' They differ widely one from the other in essential particulars, and range in date from the middle of the fifth century to the time of Alexander. I will try to group them in chronological order.

²⁵ *Ueber Darstellungen griech. Dichter auf Vasenb.*

²⁷ *Onom.* ix. 84.

²⁶ *Br. Mus. Cat., Troas, &c.*, Pl. XXXVIII.

²⁸ In the *Br. Mus. Cat.* Wroth thinks the head is of Aphrodite.

The earliest group is that which comprises two heads only, that of the Ashmolean statue, and that of the statue at Florence. Here the work of the eyes is almost archaic, long narrow eyes without any overlapping of eyelids.

FIG. 4.—THE 'OXFORD BUST.'

The curls on the cheek are also a clear survival of archaic art. These heads I reserve for further discussion.

The group second in order of date is in many ways quite different. Noteworthy examples are:—

Bust in the Ashmolean Museum, the so-called 'Oxford Bust' (Fig. 4).

Head in Corneto,²⁹ which appears to be similar but inferior.

Head in the janiform bust at Madrid, called Phaon and Sappho.³⁰

The Oxford bust is well-known, and has been frequently figured, but never adequately. I take this opportunity to edit it more seriously. (Pl. III.) The head has been put together from several fragments, but is complete except for the nose, and a part over the left temple. It is very pleasing, but unfortunately it has been so much exposed to the weather that little remains of the original surface. Especially noteworthy are the remarkable shape of the face, which is in form almost oblong, and the extremely beautiful arrangement of the hair, which is bound with crossing bands. This hair in its wavy outlines has quite the character of the fifth century.

The connexion between head and breast has caused much perplexity to archaeologists. The head has been regarded as a work of Pheidias school; but no parallel to the drapery is to be found earlier than the Pergamene age. Perhaps the nearest parallel is to be found in the drapery of figures in the frieze of the great altar at Pergamon, especially in the figure called Selene, who rides on a horse.³¹ This drapery is beautifully executed, and has suffered from weathering. It is drawn together round the bosom with a hem which, as Michaelis observed, passes tightly over the right breast without in any way modifying it. If this bust is antique, it must be part of an ancient statue with all but the front surface cut away in order to lighten it, for busts of this form were quite unknown in Greece. Furtwängler in speaking of this bust³² says that it does not belong to the head; but he does not say whether he regards it as ancient or modern. Professor Lethaby has suggested that it is a fine work of the Renaissance, and that seems to me the best solution of a difficult problem. In any case we must reject it as in no way connected with the head, and so outside the present investigation.

The head seems to be of different marble from the bust; but both marbles are Greek: I think the head is Pentelic.³³ The restorations are the nose (which is very bad) and some of the locks of hair over the left temple, which have been restored in plaster. The eyelids are almost gone: but one can still see that the outer corners of the eyes are finished in the style of the mid-fifth century, with no overlapping of the upper eyelid. In the older casts the neck was too long, in consequence of the interposition of a band of plaster between head and lower neck. This band has been partly removed.

Furtwängler and S. Reinach (a strong combination) have pronounced this head a work of the school of Pheidias. This is probable, though the arguments of neither writer can be called convincing. Furtwängler's arguments rest upon his views as to Pheidias suggested by the head at Bologna, which he regards as the Lemnian Athena. Reinach's arguments

²⁹ *Gaz. des Beaux Arts*, 1902, 2, p. 457.

³⁰ Furtwängler, *Masterpieces*, p. 68.

³¹ *Alterth. von Pergamon*, iii. 2; Pl. V.

³² *Statuenkopieen*, p. 50.

³³ A careful description in Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, p. 555.

are based upon the Laborde head, supposed to belong to the Parthenon pediment. This again is not very safe ground. The Laborde head is so much restored (forehead, nose, lips, chin, back of head)³⁴ that it is only authoritative for the treatment of hair and eyes. And as Pheidias certainly did not execute the Parthenon pediments (see p. 16), a head belonging to them can be no safe index of his style.

FIG. 5.—HEAD IN THE VILLA ALBANI.

A much safer authority for the Pheidian treatment of hair and eyes is to be found in the fragment of the head of Nemesis from Rhamnus, by

³⁴ See B. Sauer, *Der Weber-Laborde'sche Kopf*, 1903.

Agoracritus,³⁵ since this was a great religious work, and not merely decorative. Ancient critics were in doubt whether the statue was by Pheidias or Agoracritus, or by them jointly: but it is a first-rate piece of evidence for the wavy lines of the hair and the transitional corners of the eyes, which are doubtless late Pheidian in character.

A very interesting comparison may be made between the Oxford head and the head of the Greek poetess in the Palace of the Conservatori at Rome.³⁶ This delightful full-length figure, of Greek marble, clad only in a himation, has been restored as Urania, with globe and rod; but this restoration is incorrect, and the attributes of the figure are lost, only that by her side is a box of manuscripts, which is antique, and which proves that she was an authoress. According to Bulle, she originally held a lyre. The face is clearly a portrait; but the remarkable point about it is that it is unmistakably like the Oxford head. The long, almost oblong, form of the face, the long narrow eyes, the full lower lip, the fashion of hair and head-dress all correspond. The style of the Roman head is, however, somewhat more advanced and the appearance more youthful.

We must have in the two cases portraits of a poetess. There was no poetess at Athens in the fifth century. The representation is far more probably of some well-known poetess of an earlier age, such as Sappho. The dress of the Roman figure, consisting only of an over-garment which leaves the right shoulder bare, though quite usual in the case of a man, is very unusual, if not unique, in the case of a woman. What it may signify it is not easy to determine. For this head I am disposed to retain the identification as Sappho.

The third group is best represented in two heads of the Galleria Geografica and the Villa Albani³⁷ (Fig. 5). The features are of solid, not to say stolid, type. The hair is not merely bound with a *sphendone*, but almost entirely concealed by it. The eyes are large, the chin massive. There are curls on the cheek. This type certainly closely resembles the head on the bronze coins of Mytilene, which I have already tried to shew to be Sappho. I am greatly disposed to agree with Professor Winter, who regards it as a copy of the portrait of Sappho made by Silanion in the first half of the fourth century.³⁸ He compares the bronze coins of Mytilene above cited with curls on the cheek.

The fourth group is represented by a noteworthy head in the Pitti Palace at Florence³⁹ (Fig. 6). Here again the hair is almost concealed by

³⁵ *Br. Mus. Cat. of Sculpture*, i. p. 264.

³⁶ *Bull. Com. arch. comunale*, 1878, Pl. I.; Arndt-Bruckmann, *Porträts*, Pl. 143-4.

³⁷ Bernoulli, *Griech. Ikonogr.* i. pp. 65, 67.

³⁸ *Jahrbuch des Inst.* v. Pl. 3.

³⁹ Bernoulli, *Gr. Ikon.* i. p. 69; Arndt-Bruckmann, *Porträts*, Pl. 149, 150.

the kerchief. But the character of the head is quite different, passionate and enthusiastic, and at once reminding us of the works of Scopas and of Lysippus. This must be a representation of a poetess; probably a head of Sappho of the later part of the fourth century.

FIG. 6.—HEAD IN THE PITTI PALACE.

These last three groups of heads cannot in any objective sense represent the same person. They are of varied character. Even the style of the headdress is not really the same, varying between a long taenia and a kerchief. Yet of course they may all be varied representations of a person who lived before the age of portraiture. It seems not unreasonable to regard

them all as poetesses; the heads in group 3 being almost certainly intended for Sappho, the second and the fourth groups being of more doubtful attribution.

The attribution of group 1 remains for further consideration in the next section. Meantime, I wish further to justify my claim that we have in our statue an early work of the Pheidian school. We have treated separately the body and the head, and have found that both, in the present state of our archaeological evidence, point to a Pheidian origin. But this view may be unpleasing, and may even seem paradoxical, to some English students who take their notions as to Pheidias from the Elgin Room at the British Museum. So it is necessary to say a few words as to our evidence for the period and style of Pheidias.

As Pheidias was represented as a bald and elderly man on the shield of the Parthenos statue,⁴⁰ made about 440 B.C., he cannot have been born much later than B.C. 500. Among his earliest works was probably the Athena of Pellene; for if this figure of Athena is represented, as is probable, on the coins⁴¹ of the city, it is of an archaic Palladium-like type. Pheidias made for the Athenians two monuments in memory of Marathon, the great bronze Athena of the Acropolis, which was of stiff and early type, to judge from Athenian coins;⁴² and the great bronze group with portrait of Miltiades, set up at Delphi. Exactly when these works were set up we do not know; but their date is not likely to be more than twenty years after the battle (*i.e.* B.C. 470). Unfortunately we are unable to identify any of the earlier works of Pheidias among extant statues, for the intricate attempts of Furtwängler to make such identifications are far too speculative and fanciful to serve as a basis for any conclusions. Our best evidence for Pheidian style is derived from copies of the Parthenos statue dating from the Roman Age, the Lenormant statuette, the Varvakeion statuette, and the copy from Patras. A comparison of these with such figures as the Athena from Pergamon and torsoes found on the Athenian Acropolis does enable us to form a fairly adequate notion of the Parthenos statue. But of no other statue by Pheidias can we form a satisfactory idea. The attempt of Furtwängler to assign to the great master a number of works now extant in the form of Roman copies nowhere reaches more than a low degree of probability, and often rests on a very fragile substructure.

When one speaks of the work of Pheidias most people at once think of the sculptural decoration of the Parthenon. And that Pheidias was in a measure generally responsible for this is made probable by the phrase of Plutarch in reference to the buildings of Pericles, *πάντα διεῖπε καὶ πάντων ἐπίσκοπος ἦν αὐτῷ* (Περικλεῖ) Φείδίας. But that Pheidias in person and

⁴⁰ This we learn from Plutarch, *Pericles*, Pl. S, x.
ch. xi.

⁴² *Ibid.* Pl. Z, i.-vii.

⁴¹ *Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*,

minutely directed the work of sculpture on the Parthenon is most unlikely. The oversight of such work was usually taken by the architect; and the architect of the Parthenon was not Pheidias but Ictinus. Moreover, from the record which is extant of payments to sculptors for the work on the Athenian Erechtheum we may judge how many artists worked at once on a temple. In the fragment of this record which is preserved twelve sculptors are mentioned, some citizens and some resident aliens, all of whom are paid at the same rate, 60 drachmas (about 60 francs) for each figure. The pedimental figures of the Parthenon cannot be by Pheidias. An Attic inscription is preserved⁴³ which records payment to the *sculptors* (not the sculptor) of the pediments; and the date of the document, though not absolutely fixed, appears to be too late for any superintendence by Pheidias.

Any careful examination of the sculpture of the Parthenon will shew not only varieties in execution but marked differences in important points of style. For example, two adjoining figures, Hephaestus and Poseidon, in the group of gods in the east frieze, are strongly contrasted in style; so are the running Nike of the east pediment and the adjoining seated figures. The actual sculptors, whoever they were, must have had quite a free hand: and this altogether accords with what we know of the ways of Greek artists in the fifth century. There was no broad line of distinction between sculptor and stone-mason. The latter may have worked under the general direction of a noted master; but he was no slavish subordinate. We know indeed that at Epidaurus Timotheus furnished models (*τύποι*) for one of the pediments, but that may have been a fourth-century innovation. And there are strong reasons for denying close relations between Pheidias and (at all events) the pedimental figures of the Parthenon. These not only were probably made after his death or imprisonment, but also they are much freer in style than the great cultus figures for which Pheidias was noted. The fact is that the great field for practice in sculpture offered by the decoration of the Parthenon seems to have produced a very rapid improvement in freedom and technique. It seems at first sight almost incredible that some of the stiffer metopes of the Parthenon, and the pedimental group of the Fates, can have belonged to the same building, and been produced within a few years of one another.

If Pheidias was really responsible for the planning of the sculpture of the Parthenon, it must have been quite at the end of his life. His earlier activities were concentrated on such works as the great statues of Athena at Plataea and Pellene, and the magnificent bronze memorial of Marathon set up at Delphi: and we know from ancient writers that it was not for technique that he was noted, but for the preciousness of his materials, and above all for his success in embodying the highest religious ideas of his contemporaries.

⁴³ Woodward in *Annual of Brit. School*, 1909-10, p. 190. Mr. Woodward observes that Pheidias exercised practically no super-

vision over the last stages of the decoration of the Parthenon.

III.

In discussing the meaning and attribution of our statue, we have before us three alternatives. It may represent, first a deity, secondly a generalized type, or thirdly an individual.

The generalized type, to begin with the second alternative, is best represented by the great series of archaic female figures dedicated to Athena, which was discovered on the Acropolis of Athens in the excavations of the latter part of the last century. That these figures did not represent the goddess is I think generally allowed: nor did they represent her priestesses. They must have been dedicated to Athena by her worshippers. But they had nothing individual about them; they were not portraits, but *kôrai* or girls given to, and belonging to, Athena. Similar series have been found on other sites.

In the case of the present statue we may reject this interpretation. These series of *kôrai* belong rather to archaic art than to that of the fifth century, although as I have already suggested, they may have been in some places continued. But anyone who carefully looks at our statue will reject at once the notion that it represents no one in particular; it is far too full of character.

A point not without importance is its size, six feet in height. That was certainly not, at all events for a Greek woman, life size, but heroic size. The usual height for a male heroic figure was about 6 feet 8 inches (2 mètres). Six feet for a woman nearly corresponds to six feet and eight inches for a man, being about one-seventh more than the normal height, taking that at 5 feet 10 inches for a man and 5 feet 3 inches for a woman. The series of dedicated korae at Athens and elsewhere are usually below life size. The heroic scale shews that our statue is not merely one of a series, but a figure of special significance, like the figures of the Tyrannicides at Athens or the Agias group of portraits at Delphi.

There remain the two other alternatives, a deity or a portrait. But these alternatives do not strictly exclude one another. For in the great period of Greek art, as well as in its later periods, it was possible to represent a person, living or dead, in the guise of a deity, and with some of the attributes of deity. It is in this compound way that I am disposed to interpret our statue.

If, whether simply, or in a divine translation, it is a representation of an Athenian lady, one can scarcely avoid the question as to the person portrayed.

According to the manners of Athens at the time, it is very unlikely that any ordinary matron would be represented in a statue. The queens of Syria and Egypt in the third century appeared in many statues. But the Athenians of the fifth century, and especially the statesmen, held that women of repute should not be seen (save on rare occasions) outside their own houses, that

their duties were limited to control of their children and their slaves. It is unlikely that a statue of any of them would be put up in a public place.

We must consider important facts in the history of Athens. We know from the life of Pericles by Plutarch, as well as from the comedies of Aristophanes, that a revolt against the accepted view of women was in progress at the time of the Peloponnesian war, and even earlier. Many Athenian women were dissatisfied with 'the trivial round, the common task'; and wanted to become of more account in public life and even in politics. At the head of this movement were two remarkable women, Elpinice and Aspasia. They were of very different rank. Elpinice, daughter of Miltiades and sister of Cimon, belonged to one of the highest families. But she chose to disregard the conventions of propriety, was a close friend of Pericles, and though married to a distinguished citizen, Callias, did many things which at the time caused scandal. The character of Aspasia has been in modern times the subject of much controversy. In origin she was a Milesian: probably her family had been sold into slavery on the failure of the Ionian Revolt. She had become, probably without any option, a hetaera, and drifting to Athens became the mistress of Pericles, who divorced his legal wife and openly lived with her. That she was clever and highly accomplished we are assured. She seems to have held a kind of *salon* to which the friends of Pericles resorted, and even in some cases took their wives. Socrates was among her admirers; and she was even credited—by the credulous—with the composition of the speeches of Pericles. After the death of Pericles, she took up with Lysicles, a dealer in cattle, and caused him to become an orator. Evidently she was in an eminent degree unconventional. But some modern admirers who try to represent her as not only brilliant but of high character, go beyond the mark. We need not accept all the many scandalous tales told about her at Athens, for we know that scandal was as rife in ancient as it is in modern Athens. But we make a mistake when we try to transplant into the glowing air of ancient Athens modern English notions. The class to which Aspasia belonged was held in no high esteem at Athens; and though she had exceptional talent, she was not generally regarded as above corrupt influences and debased means of acquiring wealth.

These two women, Elpinice and Aspasia, are perhaps the only two women of Athens in the middle of the fifth century likely to have had their effigies put up in a public place. And it is curious that we have just two Athenian portraits of women at the period.⁴⁴ One is closely wrapped in a cloak, with a veil on the back of the head, a figure equally charming and modest (Fig. 7), which has been reconstituted by Amelung,⁴⁵ from a veiled head of fifth century type at Berlin and a body of later date, which certainly belonged to the same type. That the head had been called a head of Aspasia need not influence us, for the attribution rested on no evidence whatever. It

⁴⁴ The Hestia Giustiniani may perhaps be a third, but her place of origin is uncertain.

⁴⁵ Published by Amelung in *Röm. Mitt.* xv.

represents a dignified Athenian matron, certainly not Aspasia, but very possibly Elpinice. If a statue of Elpinice were put up, it would have been of this type.

FIG. 7.—STATUE OF AN ATHENIAN MATRON.

I am tempted to venture somewhat further in the explanation of Dr. Amelung's charming statue in connexion with our own. The question naturally suggests itself, and is discussed by Amelung,⁴⁶ whether it can be

⁴⁶ *Röm. Mitt.* xv. p. 191.

a copy of one of the most celebrated statues of antiquity, the Sosandra of Calamis, which has always been something of a puzzle. This statue was set up at the entrance to the Acropolis of Athens. Whether it was identical with a statue of Aphrodite by Calamis seen near the same spot by Pausanias⁴⁷ has been disputed, but this seems by far the most probable view. But it does not at all follow that Pausanias is right when he called the figure Aphrodite; he may have judged quite hastily. He says it was a dedication by the Athenian Callias, who was the husband of Elpinice.

I cannot here discuss at length all the views which have been put forth as regards the statue of Sosandra. This task has been very satisfactorily carried out by Studniczka.⁴⁸ I quite agree with this writer that Sosandra, the saviour of a man or men, is a singularly inept epithet for Aphrodite, who was regarded as misleading men rather than saving them. Nor does it occur anywhere else as an epithet of Aphrodite or other deities. Another explanation must be sought for.

On the Acropolis there has been found an inscription reading⁴⁹ ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΗΓΓΟΝΙΚΟ ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕΝ on a base on which once stood a bronze statue. At first of course one would suppose that this must have been the basis of the Sosandra statue. But this turns out to be a false light. For on the basis are the marks on which stood two naked feet which supported the lost statue. It could not have been a draped female figure; but it must have been a male statue—very probably an Apollo. Callias, indeed, being wealthy, may have made many dedications. However, our concern is not with the various dedications of Callias, but only with the Sosandra.

Lucian, in an often-cited passage calls the statue made by Calamis Sosandra merely, and his description of her is noteworthy. In his *Images*⁵⁰ he speaks of the figure as notable for modesty (*αἰδώς*), for a staid and unconscious smile (*μειδίαμα σεμνὸν καὶ λεληθὸς*), for the trim and orderly folds of her cloak,⁵¹ and for the veiled head. Lucian is the only ancient critic of art who has to be considered with respect; in his youth he had been a sculptor, and he knew what he was talking about. His words bring up to our minds just such a figure as that of Amelung, and it belongs to the period and probably to the style of Calamis. Archaeologists have been disposed, in the absence of clear light as to the style of this sculptor, to regard him as working in the style of the latest of the archaic dedicated figures of the Athenian Acropolis, late examples of the old Ionian art, wearing the fine chiton, and an over-garment over one shoulder or both. And certainly the terms delicacy and charm (*λεπτότης καὶ χάρις*) applied to his statues by Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁵² would apply to those statues. But they apply quite equally well to the veiled lady under consideration. And, in fact, we

⁴⁷ i. 23, 2.

⁴⁸ *Kalamis*, 1907.

⁴⁹ Studniczka, *Kalamis*, p. 54.

⁵⁰ Ch. 6.

⁵¹ The word is *ἀναβολή*, an outer garment; this excludes such figures as the Hestia Giustiniani.

⁵² *De Isocrate*, ch. 3.

can scarcely imagine that after the Persian wars, when Athens was boiling over with new ideas in art, a great sculptor like Calamis would keep up a merely traditional type. He probably retained the Ionic dress but used it with freer hand and greater artistic effect, leading art in the way in which Praxiteles afterwards developed it.

Amelung finds a difficulty about identifying his statue with the Sosandra in another passage of Lucian⁵³ in which, as he thinks, the ankles of the Sosandra are praised, and so must have been shown. The passage is ambiguous: but I cannot find in it more than a general assertion that the Sosandra was universally appreciated and warmly praised.⁵⁴ In fact it is unlikely that a draped figure of the period, notable for dignity and modesty, wearing a cloak, would show her ankles. I think that we may set this passage aside, as giving no clear evidence.

But if Callias dedicated a statue called Sosandra, the saviour of a man, it is easy to find an occasion when he might have done so. In B.C. 463 Elpinice, his wife, by pleading with Pericles, the accuser, saved her brother Cimon from being condemned to death for treason. On such an occasion it would be very natural for Callias, who was much in love with his wife, to set up her statue in the guise of Sosandra.⁵⁵ To her the matronly veil would be as suitable as it would be unsuitable to a figure of Aspasia.

The other portrait of a fifth century Athenian woman is that represented by our Ashmolean statue; as well as by the statue at Florence. It is curious that Bernoulli⁵⁶ should have remarked 'We might be disposed to search for the portrait (of Aspasia) among those heads of Aphrodite-like type, with beautiful head-covering, which we have been accustomed to call Sappho, some of which in style go back to the fifth century.' With this suggestion I am in agreement. If a statue of Aspasia were set up, it would probably represent her not as a matron, but partly as a woman and partly as a goddess.

Our statue is not a mere portrait, but a portrait of a woman in the guise of a deity. It was not without some justification that so able judges as Furtwängler and Reinach saw in the group of heads to which ours belongs representations of Aphrodite. In fact, women in Greece were seldom honoured with a statue, unless they were more or less deified: and this applies to the fifth century. Of Sappho there was a temple and a cultus at Mytilene. Leaena, the friend of the tyrant-slayer Aristogeiton, was honoured at Athens as a heroine after her death. To Phila the wife of Demetrius Poliorcetes the Athenians erected a temple, identifying her with Aphrodite. Amastris figures as a goddess on the coins of the city which bore her name. It is not at all rare to find erected on Greek tombs statues of the deceased in the guise of Hermes or even Asklepios. How easy the process of deification was among the Greeks, if any of their friends had

⁵³ *Dial. Meretr.* iii. 2.

⁵⁴ Furtwängler takes this view: *Sitzungsber. der bayer. Akademie*, 1907, part ii. p. 168.

⁵⁵ The assignment of a fresh name to those who were heroized was an ordinary custom.

⁵⁶ *Griech. Ikonogr.* i. p. 115.

money to make an endowment, is shewn by the celebrated document known as the will of Epicteta.

Perhaps the closest parallel to a deification of Aspasia as Aphrodite may be found in the similar deification of Lamia. Lamia was an Athenian hetaera who captivated Demetrius Poliorcetes, who abandoned for her his noble wife Phila. The Athenians and the Thebans both erected temples in which Lamia was adored under the name of Aphrodite. And the people of Lamia in Thessaly put on their coins a striking head of Lamia-Aphrodite.⁵⁷ The hair in this portrait hangs loose about her ears in a fashion unknown in portraits of matrons.

That Calamis should make a statue for Callias and Cimon, and Pheidias one for Pericles and Aspasia quite accords with what we know of the political relations of the two schools: Calamis was connected with the Athenian conservatives, Pheidias with the popular party of Pericles. The Aspasia-Aphrodite of Pheidias might well be a reply to the Elpinice-Sosandra of Calamis.

I must try to determine at what periods the portraits of Elpinice and Aspasia would be likely to be made. Elpinice was no longer very young when she interceded with Pericles on behalf of her brother Cimon, B.C. 463;⁵⁸ she may then have been approaching thirty, since Miltiades died in 489, and probably Elpinice was born shortly before that year.⁵⁹ Aspasia was decidedly younger. Judeich, in a careful paper in Wissowa's *Encyclopädie*, after examining the evidence, decides that Pericles' son by Aspasia must have been born in B.C. 449-440.

Amelung's statue above mentioned, with veiled head, is given by the general voice of archaeologists to about B.C. 460: Calamis flourished B.C. 480-440.⁶⁰ The Ashmolean statue I have already assigned to B.C. 460-440, which corresponds with the active period of Pheidias. There is then no reason arising out of chronology why these two statues should not respectively represent Elpinice and Aspasia, and come from the workshops of the great sculptors whom I have mentioned.

Of course, if our portrait is really of Aspasia, that would decidedly be a reason why the great master himself, as a personal friend of Pericles and Aspasia, should have made it. And he did work in marble. But the question whether a statue merely comes from the workshop of a great sculptor, or whether he himself made it, is much more important in reference to modern than in reference to ancient sculpture. The modern artist is anxious that all his work should bear his personal imprint; this search for originality did not sway an ancient artist, who was content to reproduce traditional types only improving upon them in detail, or distinguishing them by fine execution. It is probable, for the reason which I have given above, their employment on the great temples at Athens, that the pupils of Pheidias, Alcamenes, and

⁵⁷ *Br. Mus. Cat., Thessaly*, Pl. IV. 1, 2.

⁵⁸ Plutarch's *Pericles*, ch. x. Pericles, rather coarsely, tells Elpinice that she is too old for the business.

⁵⁹ Possibly the name Elpinice, 'Hope of victory,' may have had to do with Marathon.

⁶⁰ These are the dates arrived at by Studniczka, *Kalamis*, p. 81.

Agoracritus excelled their master in the production of works in marble, though they never had an opportunity of surpassing him in the great religious line of art. Lysippus was credited with the authorship of 1,500 statues, many of them of colossal size: and it is clear that he can have been only the head of a factory, though no doubt he may have impressed something of his style on all works which came out of his factory. I am quite content to say that our statue came from the workshop of Pheidias, without affirming his personal relation to it. There was shown at Olympia a workshop of Pheidias; and no doubt many years before he began the great statue of Zeus he had a workshop at Athens, alike for works in gold and ivory and in marble. Judging by what we really know as to the Pheidian treatment of drapery, we are quite justified in saying that our Ashmolean statue is just what we should expect from this workshop about the middle of the fifth century.

Supposing our head to be meant for a portrait of Aspasia as Aphrodite, it may serve to account for the accusation of impiety which we know to have been brought against her. Pheidias, as Plutarch tells us,⁶¹ was accused of impiety because he introduced portraits of himself and Pericles into the relief representing a battle with Amazons which adorned the shield of the great Parthenos statue. Surely it would be still worse impiety, if either Pericles or Aspasia set up a portrait of a concubine in guise of a goddess. The enemies of Pericles, not daring to attack himself, brought actions against his special friends, Anaxagoras, Pheidias, Aspasia, and in each case on religious grounds.

Of course it may be said that we have no direct ancient authority for these suggestions; that they rest only on an ingenious collocation of possibilities; but they certainly well fit the facts so far as they are known; and do not go beyond the limits of permissible theory. It is quite legitimate, and indeed necessary, in history to go beyond our documents by conjecture: what is wrong is to give out conjectures as facts, or to build conjecture on conjecture until the whole edifice becomes top-heavy.

Possibly a somewhat different view may commend itself to some readers. They may take their start from the curls on the cheek, exact correspondence with which is only found on the bronze coins of Mytilene, and the statues which I have allowed to represent Sappho. Why, they may say, should not our statue represent Sappho, or if Aspasia, Aspasia in the guise of Sappho? This view is plausible: but it seems less acceptable than that which I have set forth. Greek portraits in many cases represent historic persons in the guise of deities. But I do not know of one which represents one historic person in the guise of another. Alexander the Great is represented as Heracles, and as Castor,⁶² but not as Miltiades. An Athenian lady might appear as Aphrodite, or as a Muse, but not as a poetess whose works were well known. And that our statue is not a mere embodiment of someone's notion of Sappho seems to be proved both by its individual character, and by its simplicity and

⁶¹ Plutarch's *Pericles*, ch. xxxi.

⁶² In the remarkable statue lately discovered at Cyrene.

freedom from the imaginative element. Moreover, a statue of Sappho would scarcely represent her as clad in the Dorian dress.

Perhaps other objections to the identification of our figure as Aspasia may be suggested. The head is scarcely ideally beautiful in form. But the women who have affected history by their attractions have seldom been ideally beautiful; rather bright and witty, able to amuse and to charm. Also

FIG. 8.—SUPPOSED PORTRAIT OF ASPASIA IN THE VATICAN.

there is about the head a certain innocence and simplicity. Some of this may be due to the style of sculpture.

I must not, however, pass by in silence a head extant and published, which has some claim to be regarded as a portrait of Aspasia, and which differs notably from the Ashmolean statue (Fig. 8). It is a herm surmounted

by a bust of a woman, the back of whose head is covered by a veil, and whose hair is arranged in wave-like tresses like a melon running from the forehead to the back parallel to one another.⁶³ On the base of this herm is inscribed in letters, not cut with a chisel but merely scratched, ΑΣΠΑCΙΑ. This inscription has been discussed by several writers, and presents a difficult problem. On the one hand the inscription seems to have already been on the herm when it was discovered near Civitavecchia. On the other hand the letters are suspicious in form, and not put in the ordinary place. But all the writers are agreed that it is very difficult to believe that we can really have Aspasia in this woman, of most common-place type, and wearing the veil, the mark of the Athenian matron. I think that the inscription is not trustworthy, though without seeing it I cannot decide when it was cut. It would take a great deal of evidence to persuade us that Aspasia could have been represented as an ordinary matron. This head cannot in any case claim to represent a contemporary portrait, as the fashion of hair does not occur in Greek sculpture before the time of Praxiteles. If, therefore, it was intended for Aspasia, it may be a mere fancy portrait of later time.

With our Ashmolean portrait we naturally compare the only portrait by a contemporary of Pheidias which has come down to us (only alas! in Roman copies), the herm surmounted by a portrait of Pericles, a copy of a work of Cresilas of Cydonia. In our copies much of the character is lost. But enough remains to show us how artists of the great Periclean group conceived a portrait. They did not try accurately to copy details of less importance. The hair and beard they treated almost in a conventional way. Nor did they lay emphasis on the time of life; we only feel that Pericles was at the zenith of his powers. But the portrait impresses on us the calm and dignity of the statesman, with something in the face, especially the upper lip, which belonged to the actual man. Such a generic and idealized portrait I think we have in the Ashmolean statue.

Let me sum up, proceeding from the more to the less certain. We may confidently assign our statue to the middle of the fifth century, to Athens, and to the school of Pheidias. That it represents a woman in the guise of a deity or a heroine is also fairly certain. Of which woman it is a portrait is of course not so clear. But no one seems so suitable as Aspasia: we may fairly accept this identification until a better is suggested.

PERCY GARDNER.

⁶³ See Bernoulli, *Griech. Ikonogr.* p. 113. It is in the Sala delle Muse in the Vatican.