

A Methodological Enquiry: The Great Bronze Athena by Pheidias*

The 'Great Bronze Athena', or the Athena *Promachos* by Pheidias,¹ was a famous statue on the Akropolis of Athens, according to the literary sources. Numerous attempts have been made in the 19th and 20th centuries to reconstruct the image of the statue based on various sources: coins, gems, lamps, Byzantine miniatures, and sculpture.² However, some of these attempts have revealed a number of inconsistencies in treatment and interpretation of the various sources. This article, therefore, endeavours to separate the valid from the invalid through a careful assessment of all the available evidence relating to the Athena *Promachos* as the Pheidian statue rather than the iconographic type.

Any attempt to 'reconstruct the past' in this way poses difficulties and it becomes necessary to re-examine the body of existing research to enable us to reach soundly based conclusions.³

Literary evidence and the dating of the Great Bronze Athena

First of all, it should be emphasized that the sources are almost always of a much later date, and written in a completely different context to the creation of the statue. The literary sources and inscriptions can, however, supply us with some information concerning the great bronze statue. They will be introduced only briefly, in order to consider firstly the question of the name *Promachos*, secondly what information the sources can provide for the actual appearance of the statue, and finally the date indicated by the inscriptions.

* I would like to thank the following people for help and advice in writing this article: Mr J. Cheetham, Mrs C. Cullen Davison, Dr M. Moltesen, Dr D. Montserrat, Professor G.B. Waywell, and Dr.phil. J. Zahle, and I am very grateful for the comments of this Journal's anonymous readers. Please note the following special abbreviations: **Kroll**: J.H. Kroll, 'The Greek coins', *Agora* xxvi (1993); **Linfert**: A. Linfert, 'Athenen des Phidias', *AthMitt* xcvi (1982) 57-77; **Mathiopoulos**: E. Mathiopoulos, *Zur Typologie der Göttin Athena im fünften Jhr. v. Chr.* (Diss. Bonn 1961-68); **Pick**: B. Pick, 'Die "Promachos" des Phidias und die Kerameikos-Lampen', *AthMitt* lvi (1931) 59-74.

The article stems from my work on the Daidalos database where, among other things, I researched and wrote up most of the works attributed to and associated with the sculptor Pheidias. The Daidalos database is an image-database of Greek sculptors and their works at King's College London, directed by Professor G.B. Waywell, to whom I am grateful for permission to publish parts of this new data compilation. The sources related to the sculptor Pheidias on the Daidalos database have been dealt with by Mrs C. Cullen Davison, and what I present on this subject is only a brief summary of her work and conclusions; I am therefore also very grateful to her for allowing me to do so.

¹ I will use the name *Promachos* as this is generally associated with the 'Great Bronze Athena', though this is a much later epithet for the statue, as is explained below.

² A recent attempt was made by Linfert in 1982 who, as other scholars before him, wanted to see the Athena *Promachos* copied in the so-called 'Athena Medici' statue type; Linfert 66-71.

³ B.S. Ridgway, 'The study of classical sculpture at the end of the 20th century', *AJA* xcvi (1994) 759-72, is an extremely useful essay on old and new traditions in scholarship and their uses and abuses.

The epithet *Promachos*, the foremost fighter or defender, is a late designation, the earliest appearance of which is in a dedicatory inscription from the early fifth century AD found on the Akropolis.⁴ Earlier the statue was called, by Pausanias for instance, simply the 'great bronze Athena' on the Athenian Akropolis.⁵ Pausanias provides the most detailed description of the statue; he writes: 'Besides all those I have listed, there are two Athenian offerings from the tithes of spoils taken in war; one is a bronze statue of Athena, from the spoils of the Medes who landed at Marathon, which is the work of Pheidias. People say that the battle of the Lapiths and the Centaurs on the shield and all the other reliefs were engraved by Mys, and that both these and his other works were designed for Mys by Parrhasios, son of Euenor. The point of the spear and the helmet-crest of this Athena can be seen by people as they sail in from Sounion.'⁶

We may infer from this that Pheidias' Athena *Promachos* on the Athenian Akropolis was of bronze and that she carried a long spear and wore a helmet with a large crest. She also had a decorated shield, though not by Pheidias (so perhaps dated differently to the rest of the statue). Finally Pausanias tells us that the statue was erected as a reminder of the Greek victory over the Persians at Marathon in 490 BC. However, this is only a *terminus post quem*, as other statues were erected as celebrations of the Greek victory considerably later.⁷

At least one source from late Antiquity describes the Pheidian statue when it was later moved to Constantinople, but nothing decisive can be added in relation to its appearance.⁸

The building accounts for the construction of Athena *Promachos* have been identified. The inscriptions concern

⁴ IG ii² 4225L4, cf. A. Frantz, 'Late antiquity: AD 267-700', *Agora* xxiv (1988) 64 n. 49, pl. 47 f. Eadem 76-7: the statue was moved to Constantinople not earlier than and shortly after 465 AD.

⁵ Paus. i 28.2; for all the sources see J.A. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig and Hildesheim 1868-1959) nos. 637-644; inscriptions: IG i³.1 435; IG i³.2 505. Additional secure sources: Aristid. *Or.* iii 336; Scholia Aristid. *Or.* i 354; Scholia Aristid. *Or.* iii 336; Scholia Dem. *Olynthiaca* iii; Paus. vii 27.2; Paus. ix 4.1.

⁶ Text: M.H. Rocha-Pereira (Vol. i, Teubner ed., Leipzig 1973), translation by C. Cullen Davison.

⁷ The Nemesis at Rhamnous by Agorakritos was likewise erected to celebrate the Marathon victory and that statue is dated to 430-420 BC: see G. Despinis, *Symbole ste melete tou ergou tou Agorakritou* (Athens 1971) 55-61.

⁸ The sources from late antiquity have been treated by Mathiopoulos 7-10; Linfert 62-6, believes they describe the Athena Lemnia set up in Constantinople; Frantz (n. 6) 76-7, thinks we can only use Niketas Choniates *Diegesis, De Isaac*. 738B. Most recently on the Lemnia see E. Harrison, 'Lemnia and Lemnos: sidelights on a Pheidian Athena', in *KANON Festschrift E. Berger* (Basel 1988) 101-7, who identifies the Lemnia in the 'Athena Medici' statue type. Possible or related references to the later fate of the Athena *Promachos*: Apronianos *Epigram* no. 432 (=IG ii² 4225); Scholia Aristid. *Or.* 34.28 (by Arethas); Kedrenos *Comp. Hist.* i 565; Konstantinos Rhodios *Ekphrasis* 153-62; Niketas Choniates *Diegesis, De Isaac*. 738B; Theodoros Skutariotes *Synopsis Chron.* 112.14-16; Tz., *Chil.* viii 325; Zos. *Hist. Nova* v 24.7-8.

the construction of a very large bronze statue on the Athenian Akropolis and cover nine years, dated in the period c. 460-450 BC, which has therefore become the generally accepted date for the Athena *Promachos* by Pheidias.⁹ A dedicatory inscription has also been associated with the statue, though this has been rejected by more recent research; there remain two blocks each with three letters, of an originally quite long inscription, the letter types of which are dated from 480-470 BC.¹⁰ This is in general assumed to be too early for Pheidias, even though his career could have started as early as a little before 470 BC.¹¹

Material evidence for Pheidias' Great Bronze Athena

Material evidence for the statue itself is almost non-existent, but the poros foundations have long since been identified.¹² They are situated north of the procession road and approximately on the axis of the Propylaia. Furthermore the remains of a base with an egg-and-dart moulding, blocks of which have been found on the Akropolis, Akropolis north slope and in the Agora, have been associated with the base of the statue.¹³ The foundation platform has been restored to measure c. 5.25 m

⁹ Linfert 67, concludes that the inscriptions cannot be dated securely because of the lack of names of officials; the records merely state that it took nine years to make the statue, and to date according to letter type is uncertain. However, I cannot agree with his downdating to the period of the Athena Parthenos; Linfert emphasizes the warrior-epithet without any discussion of the origins of this name for Pheidias' statue, and this is of course linked to his identification of the 'Athena Medici' as the *Promachos*—see further below under the discussion of the attributed statues. The date around 450 for the construction inscriptions is maintained by Lewis in IG i³.1 435, and by most other scholars, see for instance A.F. Stewart, *Greek sculpture. An exploration* (Princeton 1990) 23, 60, 257, who dates it around 450 and before the Athena Parthenos.

¹⁰ A.E. Raubitschek and G.P. Stevens, 'The pedestal of the Athena *Promachos*', *Hesperia* xv (1946) 108-14, restored the dedication as 'The Athenians made the dedication from the Median spoils'; A.E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis* (Cambridge, Mass. 1949) 198-201 no. 172. Most recently, the late Professor D. Lewis at Oxford expressed doubts about this restoration. He pointed to the use of the cross bar theta, which should date the inscription to shortly after 480 BC, a date too early for a Pheidian statue, IG i³.2 505. See also J.A. Bundgaard, *Parthenon and the Mycenaean city on the Heights* (Copenhagen 1976) 165-7, whose conclusion does not contradict Lewis. On the letter types see also H.R. Immerwahr, *Attic script. A survey* (Oxford 1990) 145-6.

¹¹ C. Höcker and L. Schneider, *Phidias* (Hamburg 1993) 11, present the common opinion when they write that Pheidias was probably born around 490 and that his early major state works must be from around 460. However, a sculptor like Michelangelo who was born in 1475 created the Pietà group in St. Peter's Rome in 1496-1500.

¹² Beulé, *L'Acropole d'Athènes* ii (1854) 307 ff; G.P. Stevens, 'The Periclean entrance court', *Hesperia* v (1936) 443-520, esp. 491-3, figs. 42-3; Raubitschek and Stevens (n.12) 107-14; W.B. Dinsmoor, 'Two monuments on the Athenian Akropolis', in *Charisterion, Festschrift to A.K. Orlandos* iv (1967-8) 145-55.

¹³ H.A. Thompson, 'A colossal moulding in Athens', in *Charisterion, Festschrift to A.K. Orlandos* i (Athens 1965) 314-23: classicistic; Dinsmoor (n.14) 147-8: reworked in the Augustan period.

x c. 5.25 m.¹⁴ This has permitted scholars to reconstruct the statue with considerable variations in height, between 7 m and 16 m. The latter figure would have made the statue 6 m higher than the Propylaia and 10 m lower than the Parthenon.¹⁵ This is an enormous height, bearing in mind that the Athena Parthenos was c. 12 m high, for instance. Several scholars therefore find the 16 m far too high and prefer to reconstruct the Athena *Promachos* to between 7 and 10 m.¹⁶ But if the coins are to be believed, the Athena *Promachos* was extraordinarily high, and although it is unlikely that it projected higher than the pediments of the Parthenon, as the coins suggest, the statue might have been more than the normally more modestly suggested 7-10 m. However, it is impossible to settle this question with certainty and it does not have any major bearing on the assessment of the appearance of the original statue as seen in possible later depictions.¹⁷

More recently the remains of a large moulding pit have been associated with the statue. It is located on the South side of the Akropolis and dates apparently from the second half of the fifth century BC.¹⁸ However, there were indeed other large-scale bronze statues erected on the Akropolis in the second half of the fifth century BC, one such being the 'Wooden horse' mentioned by Pausanias.¹⁹ There is no secure evidence that this particular pit is related to the creation of the *Promachos*

¹⁴ W.B. Dinsmoor, 'Attic building accounts' *AJA* xxv (1921) 118-29; Raubitschek and Stevens (n.12) 108.

¹⁵ Dinsmoor (n.16); however, according to J.A.K.E. de Waele, *The Propylaia of the Akropolis in Athens* (Amsterdam 1990) 47, the Propylaia are calculated to have been 14.70 m high.

¹⁶ Stevens (n.14) 495-7; H.G. Niemeyer, *Promachos. Untersuchung zur Darstellung der bewaffneten Athena in archaischer Zeit* (Waldsassen 1960) 789 n. 305.

¹⁷ Cf. M. Weber, *JDAI* cviii (1993) 83-122, esp. 108: it is impossible to extrapolate the height of a statue from the dimensions of its base.

¹⁸ G. Zimmer, *Griechische Bronzegegusswerkstätten* (Mainz am Rhein 1990) 62-71: the date could be as late as 440-430 BC. The pit was originally found in 1876/77 and re-excavated in 1963. There are two oval pits which touch on the long sides. The total surface they cover is 8.20 m x 20.90 m and the depth is 3 m. There are different phases in both which complicate the interpretation. The most western pit has a sort of platform at its bottom of 1.8 m x 2.5 m which should be equivalent to the lower part of the item cast here. The pits were earlier dated according to pottery found in the eastern most pit dating from the late fourth century BC. However, in fact, the date is open for the western pit, and Zimmer dates this pit on the shape and technical characteristics of the 'Formuntersatz' as compared with one in the Kerameikos (his cat.no. 8.4.1 from mid-fifth century BC), and a similar one in Olympia (cat.no. 8.4.5, Pheidias' workshop). Further parallels are made with evidence from the bronze casting workshop below the Pheidian workshop in Olympia (cat.no. 4.3.2) which Zimmer, 68, finds could have been used by Pheidias or his master caster for an unknown bronze statue. However, I will argue that this evidence does not securely alter the date if the pit is to be associated with the *Promachos*. The technical characteristics for colossal-scale casting must have been introduced by someone somewhere, and no better occasion exists than the great demands generated by the creation of the large Athena statue on the Akropolis to develop new methods. The date shortly before 450, therefore, should be maintained.

¹⁹ Paus. i 23.8.

—accordingly no supportive evidence is provided by it for a lower dating of the *Promachos*.

Artistic representations of the *Promachos* can only be certainly identified on a few Roman coins. Earlier research, however, which has been followed by most recent writings, attempted to identify the statue type on several Roman coins, on Roman lamps and in a few miniatures in Byzantine manuscripts. This led to various identifications of sculpture in the round as copies of the Athena *Promachos*.²⁰

The Coin Evidence

Though small and crude, the representations on coins provide some important information about the general appearance of the lost statue, which also accords with the literary sources. The main group of coins was originally discussed by Pick in 1931²¹ who was to a large extent followed in his conclusions by Pfuhl in the following year.²² The chronology of these coins was reassessed by Shear in 1936,²³ but has more recently been convincingly settled by Kroll.²⁴

Mathiopoulos, who dealt with all the evidence related to the Athena *Promachos*,²⁵ attributed the images on as many as four different major coin types to be representations of the Athena *Promachos*. Of these four main groups three depict the whole statue and one shows the bust alone.²⁶ Her divisions will be followed here, although it is clearly the first group which is of importance; the arguments for rejecting the other groups which are included in the discussion by most scholars will be considered below.²⁷

The **first group** coincides with some of Pick's work.²⁸ This group consists of Attic coins of the second and third centuries AD.²⁹ On the reverse they show a general view of the Akropolis from the North with a large female statue facing west towards the Propylaia standing between the Propylaia and the Erechtheion.³⁰

²⁰ Mathiopoulos 7-47, referred to without questioning by, for instance, R. Tölle-Kastenbein, *Frühklassische Peplosfiguren. Originale* (Mainz am Rhein 1980), 58; S.G. Miller *Hesperia Supp.* xx (1982) 94; *LIMC* ii (1984), s.v. 'Athena' and 'Athena/Minerva'; contra: e.g. W. Gauer, 'Weihgeschenke aus den Perserkriegen', *IstMittBeih* ii (1968) 103-5.

²¹ Pick 59-74.

²² E. Pfuhl, *AthMitt* lviii (1932) 151-7.

²³ J.P. Shear, 'Athenian Imperial Coinage', *Hesperia* v (1936) 285-332.

²⁴ Kroll *passim*—see below.

²⁵ Mathiopoulos 7-47.

²⁶ Mathiopoulos 13-22; the bust type was, prior to this, also discussed in connection with Athena *Promachos* by Pick 59-64.

²⁷ L. Lacroix, *Les reproductions de statues sur les monnaies grecques* (Liège 1949) 281-6, rejected Pick but has unfortunately not been followed by subsequent scholars.

²⁸ Pick 64-72; cf. J.N. Svoronos and B. Pick, *Les Monnaies d'Athènes* (Munich 1923-26) pl. 98 nos. 19-43; Mathiopoulos 13-17. Pick subdivided it into ten groups and he saw two versions of the Athena type in his first group, but this was rejected by Mathiopoulos.

²⁹ Kroll 115-6; second century AD; P.J. Riis, *AArch* xlv (1974) 124-133, esp. 130-1 n. 22. In the British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, a specimen of this type is dated to the third century AD.

³⁰ Earlier thought to be the Parthenon; for the identification now see M.J. Price and B.L. Trell, *Coins and their cities* (London 1977) 77.

The statue is seen either (1) in three-quarter view from the back turned towards the right [PLATE Ia], (2) in profile to the right [PLATE Ib], or (3) as laterally reversed in profile to the left [PLATE Ic]. She wears a garment with a belt and a crested helmet of uncertain type, sometimes Attic sometimes Corinthian. One arm is stretched forward and holds a winged object and on the earlier and best die or dies she can be seen with a spear leaning against one shoulder and a shield resting on the ground next to her [PLATE Ia].³¹ Sometimes the statue is seen standing on a base.³²

From the evidence in the literary sources there is little doubt that this statue is the large bronze statue made by Pheidias which stood on the Athenian Akropolis. As is clear from the coins themselves, there is little secure evidence for the exact types of garment, helmet and attribute of Athena. This has nevertheless not prevented several scholars from drawing conclusions of a quite far-reaching character. Pick concluded that Athena wore a 'double-chiton' with belt and overfold, a Corinthian helmet with one crest, held a Nike in her right hand and had a spear leaning against her left shoulder, and finally that she carried a shield on her left arm.³³ The last statement in particular is completely without foundation, as even Pick himself had indicated in his description of the coins that he also only saw the shield resting by Athena's side and on one coin issue alone.³⁴ This does not make it certain that there was a shield by Athena's side, only a very likely possibility, but it makes it quite unreasonable and unfounded to place a shield on Athena's arm. For more practical reasons the shield is also more logically placed by her side as it was created separately and by different artists, rather than being an incorporated part of the statue as a shield held on the upper arm would be.³⁵ Furthermore there is no clear evidence to decide the type of helmet Athena wore, which is of great importance in the attribution of further coin and lamp types. A more convincing suggestion is related to the garment which is in all likelihood a peplos, because of the lack of folds and the stiff column-like appearance of the statue as a whole.³⁶

The **second group** of coins associated with the Athena *Promachos* consists of coins from the last third or last quarter of the third century BC.³⁷ Previously they were wrongly associated with Athenian cleruchs in Methana

³¹ There are three examples of this out of a total of 31 coins, cf. Svoronos (n.30) pl. 98 nos. 19-20; Pick 65, pl. I 12, Beilage/encl. XXVIII.1; see also Kroll no. 280 with further examples of the general type and discussion on 124 n. 64.

³² Svoronos (n.30) pl. 98 nos. 23-9.

³³ Pick 71: 'gegürteten Doppelchiton mit Überschlag'; his description has basically been followed by later scholars.

³⁴ Pick 65; Mathiopoulos 16 n. 54 rejects the raised shield.

³⁵ Paus. i 28.2; contra: Linfert 66-7, who finds support for the shield positioned on the back in the Byzantine miniatures; on this subject see further below.

³⁶ This of course also tallies with the typical dress for Athena in the early to mid-fifth century BC representations; see for instance B.S. Ridgway, in *Goddess and polis, The Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens*, ed. J. Neils (New Hampshire 1992) 136.

³⁷ F.S. Kleiner, *Hesperia* xlv (1975) 302-30.

in the second and first centuries BC.³⁸ On the reverse the goddess stands erect in profile to the right, with the right leg relaxed and set very slightly back [PLATE 1d]. She wears a peplos and a Corinthian helmet with one crest. The slightly raised left arm holds an owl, the right arm is stretched forward and holds a patera.³⁹ The coins probably show a specific statue of Athena, as is made clear in some of the depictions by the representation of a statue base beneath the figure. The divergences from the Akropolis coins of Group 1 are, of course, the patera in the right hand and the attribute in the left hand securely depicting an owl. Furthermore there is no spear or shield, and the helmet is, on these coins, always shown as Corinthian.⁴⁰ The identification is clearly not convincing when the evidence is looked at more closely. In recent years these coins have, as indicated, been reassessed and a wholly new and far more persuasive interpretation has been put forward by Kroll.⁴¹ The dress is likely to be a peplos, and should be understood as the actual peplos woven for and worn by the Athena Polias: the attributes of the owl and the patera fit nicely with the information recorded by the Treasurers of Athena.⁴² The description, date and interpretation of these coins as given by Svoronos and followed by Mathiopoulos for her conclusions are obviously incorrect, and on the basis of Kroll's work this group of coins is not relevant to a discussion of the appearance of the Pheidian Athena *Promachos*.⁴³ This, of course, leaves us with no further secure evidence for the type of helmet Athena wore and the type of winged attribute she held, but it must be stressed that it constitutes an over-interpretation of the evidence to conclude that Athena *Promachos* wore a Corinthian helmet and held an owl in the hand stretched forward, when the other features do not accord with the Athena *Promachos* on the coins of the first group.

³⁸ B.V. Head, *Catalogue of Greek coins Attica-Megara-Aegina* (London 1888), 69, 84, pl. XV. 3; Svoronos (n.30) pl. 25 nos. 1-10; Mathiopoulos 17-8. Methana in the north of the Argolis, not far from Troizen, seems never to have been settled by Athenian cleruchs. The city was captured by the Athenians in the Peloponnesian war and used as a base for attacks on Troizen and Epidaurus. It became independent in the fourth century BC and struck its own coins, cf. S. Lauffer (ed.), *Griechenland. Lexikon der historischen Stätten* (Munich 1989) 427. From the third century until the middle of the second century BC the city was a base for the Ptolemies. They gave it the name Arsinoe and put their own images on the coins, cf. C. Habicht, *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich 1994) 162-3 with refs. Mathiopoulos 17, even ascribes some of the coins to the Athenian magistrates Niketes-Dionysios of 197-187 BC. According to more recent research there did exist a couple of Athenian coin magistrates of these names, but they are from 98/97 BC, and brothers from the demos Eupyridae, sons of Athenobios (Habicht *ibid.* 297).

³⁹ Svoronos (n.30) pl. 25 nos. 1-10; J.H. Kroll, *Hesperia Suppl.* xx (1982) 65-76; Kroll nos. 66, 68.

⁴⁰ Mathiopoulos 16 n. 53, explains the changing types of helmet on the coin types in the first group as a typical Roman confusion, cf. E. Langlotz, *Phidiasprobleme* (Frankfurt am Main 1947) 74.

⁴¹ *Supra* n.41.

⁴² IG ii² 1424L11-16; 1425L307-312; 1426L4-8; 1428L142-146; 1429L42-47; and in IG ii² ii 1424aL362-366; cf. Kroll (n.41) 68 n. 18

⁴³ See in general the comments on interpreting coin images by M. Thompson, *Hesperia Suppl.* xx (1982) 163-71.

Mathiopoulos' **third group** consists of Attic bronze coins and Alexandrian gold medallions dating from the second half of the third century AD.⁴⁴ On the reverse Athena is seen standing in profile to the right, holding an owl in her right hand, and with a transverse spear leaning against the opposite side [PLATE 1e]. Between the spear point and Athena's legs there is sometimes a snake coiled by her feet, or behind her a column with a facing owl can be seen. As in the case of the examples from Group 2, the figure of Athena bears some similarity to that shown on coins from Group 1, so that identification with the Athena *Promachos* is, in theory, possible. Some of the Group 3 coins suggest an outdoor location for the statue as they show an olive-tree growing behind Athena. Another characteristic of this group is that Athena is depicted wearing an aegis, while in addition the Abukir medallion shows Athena holding a Corinthian helmet in her outstretched hand. The spear supports a possible identification, but the aegis is an attribute typical of any Athena statue, though not visible on the Akropolis coins of Group 1. However, the owl on the column behind and the helmet in her hand are features definitely not seen on the Group 1 coins. The smaller scale might have caused the die-cutter to exclude these elements on the Akropolis coins, but that is a mere hypothesis. The outdoor setting is fitting for the Athena *Promachos*, but her large scale makes it unlikely that an olive tree would have reached this high and been visible behind her, though some artistic liberties should of course be allowed. The Akropolis is indeed the place for Athena's olive tree and the association of an Athena statue standing on the Akropolis and the olive tree is very possible, but there are no decisive reasons for interpreting the image on these coins as being the Pheidian great bronze statue.⁴⁵ This conclusion is further underlined by the missing shield from the Group 3 coins.

Finally, the **fourth group** that Mathiopoulos, and before her Pick, had chosen to include depicts the bust of Athena alone.⁴⁶ The bronze coins are Attic or provincial Roman, fall into the period between the first half of the second and the second half of the third century AD and are very common. They show the bust of Athena wearing a Corinthian helmet, her hair is pulled back up under the helmet, beside the face, and gathered in a pony tail on the nape of the neck. On her chest she wears an aegis with snakes [PLATE 1f].

According to Pick, the large number of coins of Athena wearing a Corinthian helmet, as opposed to the smaller group wearing an Attic helmet, shows that the former representation was more popular than the latter. He believes that the Athena in the Attic helmet depicts the Athena Parthenos, while the Athena in the Corinthian helmet depicts the *Promachos*. His argument is to

⁴⁴ H. Dressel, *Fünf Goldmedaillons aus dem Funde von Abukir* (Berlin 1906) 15; J.N. Svoronos, *JourIntArchNum* xiv (1912) 193-339, esp. 278; Svoronos (n.30) pl. 84 nos. 1-7 & 9-14; Mathiopoulos 18-20; Kroll nos. 301-2.

⁴⁵ This is the image Price and Trell (n.32) 76 fig. 132 find 'conforms most closely to the Athena *Promachos* shown on the Acropolis coin'; *contra* Kroll 124 n. 64.

⁴⁶ Svoronos (n.30) pls. 82-99; Pick 59-60; Mathiopoulos 20-5; Kroll *passim*, esp. 121.

some extent based on the likelihood that images of the *Promachos* and Parthenos 'fought for supremacy' over each other, which might explain why the two bust types even appear on either side of the same coin.⁴⁷ More recently other scholars have been attracted to Pick's statistics, but his use of them is unconvincing.⁴⁸ From the evidence put forward above, this fourth group should be rejected since the identification is based solely on the type of helmet, the Corinthian, and we have seen no reason to believe that the Athena *Promachos* wore a Corinthian helmet rather than an Attic one.

It should just be mentioned that, in addition to the coins, there are gems which also show two Athena types with a Corinthian and an Attic helmet respectively. The Aspasios gem is a well-known example which unquestionably depicts the Athena Parthenos, while, according to Pick, a gem in the British Museum from the Castellani Collection depicts the *Promachos* type.⁴⁹ The resemblance to the coins of Group 4 is far from striking and the overall rejection of these coins of course necessitates the gem being removed as evidence for the appearance of the Athena *Promachos*.

In conclusion only the coins of Group 1 can be considered to provide a secure, though crude, image of Athena *Promachos*, and they must provide the foundation for any further attempts at identification.

The Lamp Evidence

The lamps associated with Athena *Promachos* have also been examined by Pick in particular. He carried out the research which is still referred to on this subject and his conclusions are still followed by most scholars.⁵⁰ Pick associated two Athena images on Roman lamps with the Athena *Promachos*. Following on from his identification of the bust of Athena *Promachos* wearing a Corinthian helmet on a number of Roman coins (Group 4) he extended his range of material evidence to include Roman lamps with the same type of image, and he also recognized the whole statue in an Athena figure on late Roman lamps.⁵¹ The first mentioned group of

lamps with the bust of Athena and associated with the *Promachos* dates from the late second to the sixth centuries AD. The bust of Athena is seen in profile to the left wearing the Corinthian helmet; she has an aegis on her chest and in some instances a spear can be seen behind her head placed diagonally across the picture field [PLATE IIa].⁵² A substantial number of these lamps was found in the Athenian Agora, the earliest of which were made locally in the second and third centuries AD.⁵³ The Attic lamps with the Athena bust were copied from South Russia to Egypt, and in some instances made from moulds taken from an Attic lamp.⁵⁴

This type of lamp reveals serious confusion among scholars in the treatment and use of the image. An example of this can be found in *LIMC* under various entries; under 'Athena (in Aegypto)' a lamp from Alexandria is listed. The image on the disc of the lamp is cautiously described as a motif of Attic inspiration.⁵⁵ In the same volume of *LIMC*, but under the entry 'Athena/Minerva' a similar lamp from the Athenian Agora is presented. One of the references is identical to that under the Egyptian lamp, but the Athena bust on the Agora lamp is without any hesitation identified as Pheidias' Athena *Promachos*.⁵⁶ However, it is also stated that there is a very large number of Corinthian and Athenian lamps of this type and no attempt has hitherto been made to list them.⁵⁷ With the discussion of the coins in Group 4 in mind, these lamps should be seen as merely depicting a bust of the goddess Athena with a Corinthian helmet, as opposed to the statue of Athena *Promachos* by Pheidias. The identification rests far too heavily on the type of helmet worn—the Corinthian—and on the existence of the coins with the same bust type. As argued above under the coins, we have no proof that Pheidias' *Promachos* wore this helmet type, and accordingly this group of lamps should be excluded

⁵² Pick 61-4, fig. 1, Beilage/enc. XXVII; Perlzweig (n.52) 111-12 nos. 659-666; Mathiopoulos 23-5.

⁵³ Mathiopoulos 24; Perlzweig (n. 52) 111; early Corinthian lamps also show an Athena bust but it is an image different to the Athena *Promachos*, and only Corinthian lamps dated to the third century onwards depict the same image of Athena as the Attic lamp types.

⁵⁴ There is, furthermore, an earlier example of the same type found in Athens, a lamp from the Kerameikos: Pick 62; Mathiopoulos 23-24, n. 101-2.

⁵⁵ *LIMC* ii (1984) s.v., 'Athena (in Aegypto)' no. 41 (H. Cassimatis); a reference is made 'pour une lampe semblable' in H.S. Robinson, 'Pottery of the Roman period', *Agora v* (1959) 81 Group L no. 63, pl. 36; this is *not* a lamp but a bowl.

⁵⁶ *LIMC* ii (1984) s.v. 'Athena/Minerva' no. 36 (Canciani), with the reference to Robinson (n.57) as in the previous note, though now correctly to a 'rilievo del fondo di tazze'. There is unfortunately no cross-reference anywhere in the *LIMC* volume to these two differing views on the interpretation of the same image of Athena on the two lamps.

⁵⁷ Perlzweig (n.52) 111, does refer to cautious questioning of Pick by some scholars, and she believes Pick would have had a stronger case had he understood the difference of the Attic Athena *Promachos* lamps from the early Corinthian lamp types with Athena; Bailey (n.52: 1988) 7; K.W. Slane, 'The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore. The Roman pottery and lamps' *Corinth xviii.2* (Princeton 1990) 15, 28 no. 17 =L 4353.; D.W.J. Gill and D. Hedgecock, 'Debris from an Athenian lamp workshop', *ABSA lxxxvii* (1992) 411-21.

⁴⁷ Pick 61-3, pl. I, 1/2, 6/7.

⁴⁸ Mathiopoulos 21 and most recently in *LIMC* ii (1984), s.v. 'Athena' no. 145, 1030 (Demargne); *ibid.* s.v. 'Athena/Minerva' no. 60 (Canciani); contra Kroll 124 n. 64.

⁴⁹ Aspasios gem, Rome, Museo Nazionale delle Terme, see for instance G. Becatti, *Problemi fidiaci* (Milan and Florence 1951) pl. 63 fig. 188; Castellani gem—see H.B. Walters, *Catalogue of the engraved gems and cameos, Greek, Etruscan and Roman in the British Museum* (London 1926) no. 1374, pl. XIX.

⁵⁰ Pick *passim*; D.M. Bailey, *A catalogue of the lamps in the British Museum ii. Roman lamps made in Italy* (London 1980) 13; *LIMC* ii (1984), s.v. 'Athena' no. 145 (Demargne); 'Athena/Minerva' nos. 36-37, 112 (Canciani); D.M. Bailey, *A catalogue of the lamps in the British Museum iii. Roman provincial lamps* (London 1988), *passim*. J. Perlzweig, 'The lamps of the Roman period', *Agora vii* (1961) 111, criticized Pick and emphasized that the images of Athena with a Corinthian helmet on numerous Roman lamps and emblemata 'do not bring any direct evidence to bear on the identification of the type; they simply add weight to the argument that the original was a world-famous statue in Athens.' However, Perlzweig, *ibid.*, is still referred to on a par with Pick.

⁵¹ Both groups are known not only in Athens but also in Corinth, Southern Russia, Gaul, Italy, and Egypt (see below).

from the evidence for the appearance of the statue.⁵⁸

The second lamp type with the whole figure of Athena depicts her standing in an advancing position to the left, armed with a spear in one hand, a raised shield on the other arm, and wearing a helmet of uncertain type on her head [PLATE IIb].⁵⁹ The lamps are dated from the first to the sixth centuries AD and the type existed all over the Roman Empire.⁶⁰ The early version, of which only a couple were found in the Agora,⁶¹ seems to have been more popular in the western part of the Roman Empire in the first century AD.⁶²

As recently as 1988, in the Agora publication on 'Late Antiquity', another example of this advancing Athena was presented for consideration, dated to around 500 AD, and described as the Athena *Promachos*.⁶³ This whole group of lamps with the standing Athena should be rejected as depicting the *Promachos* by Pheidias, based on the pose and the way the weapons are carried. As argued above, Athena on the Akropolis coins of Group 1 is neither seen taking a step, carrying the shield on her arm, nor with the spear on the opposite side.⁶⁴ Rather, these lamps show the typical sixth century BC Archaic Athena *Promachos*, the type also known from the Panathenaic amphoras.⁶⁵ The 'warrior' epithet for Pheidias' statue was a later and appropriate addition for the statue commemorating the victory over the Persians, but it bears no association with the actual appearance of the bronze statue on the Akropolis as evidenced by the coin images of Group 1 and should not arbitrarily be

⁵⁸ This has been assumed earlier but the evidence has never been discussed in detail; see for instance Niemeyer (n.18) 76-86; Gauer (n.22) 103-5 and I. Kasper-Butz, *Die Göttin Athena im klassischen Athen* (Frankfurt am Main 1990) 178-80.

⁵⁹ Pick 71-2, Beilage/enc. XXVIII. 5-6 ; Perlzweig (n.52), nos. 50, 116, 2364; *LIMC* ii (1984) s.v. 'Athena/Minerva', no. 112 (Canciani) =Agora L 2454/50 cf. L 2364, and cf. *idem* 1079 no. 60 (coin with the bust of Athena).

⁶⁰ Not many of the extant lamps from Athens depict a standing figure of Athena. Pick gives three examples, which he also associates with the Athena *Promachos*, two of which perhaps come from the Kerameikos. Pick also refers to some late lamps found at Vari, showing the same bust and a standing Athena figure; for these lamps, see S.E. Bassett, *AJA* vii (1903) 338-49, fig. 3 for the bust and pl. XIII. 1 for the standing Athena.

⁶¹ Perlzweig (n.52) nos. 50, 116.

⁶² Bailey (n.52, 1980) 13.

⁶³ Frontispiece in Frantz (n.6): a lamp from c. 500 AD found on the Agora and which according to the picture text shows the 'Athena *Promachos*', cf. Perlzweig (n. 52) no. 2364. The only 'Promachos' discussed in the volume by Frantz is indeed Pheidias' statue, and when it was possibly moved to Constantinople. I presume it must therefore have been thought that the image on the disc of the lamp could illustrate this famous work of art, but unfortunately there is no attempt made to investigate the trustworthiness of the conclusions originally made by Pick for this particular Athena type.

⁶⁴ In an attempt to explain why the spear had moved from the shield-side to the other side, as opposed to the coins of Group 1, Pick 72, concluded that the spear was a column, added in later times in order to support the Nike; even the editors of *AthMitt* lvi (1931) 72 n.2 emphasized that they still saw the spear as a spear and not a Nike on a column.

⁶⁵ J.D. Beazley, *The development of Attic black figure vasepainting* (rev.ed. D. v. Bothmer and M.B. Moore, Berkeley 1986) 81-92.

introduced when assessing the lamps as means of identification.

The Byzantine miniatures

The representations in Byzantine and later manuscripts, which are supposed to show the statue displayed at a later stage in Constantinople, are also discussed by Mathiopoulos.⁶⁶ However, these representations are very generic as they just depict ancient statues of gods, of Athena in this instance, as illustrations to ancient literature on various subjects. In other words, the miniatures might have been inspired by specific statues but do not intend to depict these in exact detail.⁶⁷ The Athena type seen on one miniature in a late eleventh century Byzantine manuscript shows an erect statue on the top of a high column [PLATE IIc].⁶⁸ Her right leg is set to the side, she has a helmet on her head, and a gorgoneion can be made out on her chest. She holds a long spear in her right hand and a shield rests on the ground to her left. Her head is turned to the right. The general pose and the attributes tally to some extent with the coin images of Group 1 and with the description given by Nicetas Choniates of the destruction of a large bronze statue of Athena in 1203. However, according to both types of sources one hand was stretched out, and on the basis of the coins alone it is not possible to identify one leg as bearing, the other relaxed and the head as inclined. An objection is also the spear, which seems to have changed sides. Lastly, the fact that the statue was placed on top of a high column makes the identification even more unlikely, bearing in mind that the *Promachos* would have been at least 7 m high on her own. It is very doubtful whether this is a depiction of Pheidias' great bronze Athena standing in the Forum of Constantine in Constantinople; the miniature gives the general outline, but was created for a completely different reason than portraying fifth century BC statues, as a result of which it is not of much use as regards determining the appearance of Athena *Promachos*.

Statues associated with the Great Bronze Athena

Finally, the two most widespread sculptural associations with the Athena *Promachos* will be discussed. The first statue type seen as a possible representation of the Athena *Promachos* is the 'Athena Medici' [PLATE IIa].⁶⁹

Several attempts have been made to link this sculptural type with the Athena *Promachos*; most recently

⁶⁶ Mathiopoulos 9-10; see also R.J.H. Jenkins, *JHS* lxxvii (1947) 31-3 & *idem*, *ABSA* xlvi (1951) 72-4; Niemeyer (n.18) 79-83; Gauer (n.22) 103-5; Linfert 59-66, believes this to be the Athena Lemnia; for further discussion of this view: R.H.W. Stichel, *Boreas* xi (1988) 155-64 and Linfert's reply in *Boreas* xii (1989) 137-40.

⁶⁷ Niemeyer (n.18) 80; Gauer (n.22) 105.

⁶⁸ Jenkins (n.68, 1947) pl. X, no longer in existence cf. Jenkins (n.68, 1951).

⁶⁹ The name piece is in the Louvre, Paris, MA 3070, H: 2.605 m. For a list of replicas combine Linfert 76-7 and P. Karanastassis, 'Untersuchungen zur kaiserzeitlichen Plastik in Griechenland II: Kopien, Varianten und Umbildungen nach Athena-Typen des 5. Jhs. v. Chr.', *AthMitt* cii (1987) 339 n.63, nos. B II, 1-9.

Linfert has argued in favour of this theory.⁷⁰ However, the revision earlier in this paper of the coin material strongly refutes such an identification. The 'Athena Medici' in the Louvre can be described as the torso of an Athena standing frontally with the right foot set to the side, wearing a chiton, peplos and cloak, and an aegis on her chest. Some of the replicas confirm that she carried a shield on her left arm and held a spear in her right hand.⁷¹ The attributes therefore do not tally with the only secure coin image from Group 1.⁷² A winged attribute cannot be associated with the 'Medici' statue type. And the shield has moved from the ground to the arm and the spear from the shield-side to the other hand.

As already mentioned briefly, Linfert's arguments depend upon the association of the great bronze Athena with the Archaic Promachos type, showing the goddess with a raised shield. Linfert offers eleven interrelated points of argument in favour of the identification, of which seven are solely concerned with the location of the shield on the arm and shoulder. As shown clearly above, the coins of Group 1 provide no support whatsoever for this theory. According to Linfert, the shield of the original statue was held, rather than resting on the ground, because of the emphasis on the statue as a monument of victory, but as it was very big it must have been supported from below, and this was in fact why a terrace wall is reconstructed as placed slightly diagonally to the base. In support of Linfert's identification of the statue type with the great bronze Athena, attention is drawn to the fact that part of the cloak of the 'Medici' torso in the Louvre, which is slightly raised at the back, looks like a pillar support, and which might therefore also have acted as a 'prop' for the shield. However, an argument against this interpretation is that the copy tradition is not unambiguous on this particular detail.⁷³ Furthermore, the fact that many of the copies of the 'Athena Medici' type are acrolithic suggests that the original was made using this or the chryselephantine technique, both indicating an indoor setting, whereas the *Promachos* was of bronze and indeed placed in the open. Linfert argues that the three marble copies of the right, chiton-covered leg were in fact made from a separate mould for this particular piece of the bronze statue.⁷⁴ This is unconvincing for technical reasons; professionals in casting techniques have con-

firmed that a piece the size of 'Athena Medici's' draped right leg is unlikely to have been cast in one vertical piece and separately.⁷⁵ If several pieces were cast separately, they are more likely to have been of the lower quarter of the statue, the next quarter and so on, i.e. employing a horizontal division for such a massive statue rather than a vertical one as Linfert is indirectly suggesting.

There is also the question of the size of the 'Athena Medici'. Most of the large copies are very similar in size, that is c. 3-3.5 m high and this suggests that the original statue was about this height. The *Promachos* was substantially larger than this, perhaps as much as three or four times that size, and the evidence from the Athena Parthenos replicas tends to go against copies of colossal statues being made of a very similar character and size, as is the case with the 'Athena Medici'.⁷⁶ Finally, the 'Athena Medici' type has generally been dated to a good few years after the proposed date of c. 460-450 BC for the Athena *Promachos*. The statue type would seem to fit more naturally around 440-430 BC, especially with regard to the drapery style.⁷⁷ Ascribing the Athena *Promachos* to a later date involves rejecting the building accounts, which seems rather haphazard, and bearing in mind the evidence already presented for the appearance of the Athena *Promachos*, the 'Athena Medici' must therefore be rejected as a copy of it.⁷⁸

There is more widespread agreement on the association of the so-called 'Athena Elgin' with the Athena *Promachos* [PLATE II].⁷⁹ The 'Athena Elgin' supposedly came from Attica and is a small bronze statuette of a standing Athena wearing a heavy peplos and a Corinthian helmet. She has one leg set slightly back, but both feet are fully on the ground. She carries an owl in her outstretched right hand and the left hand is held down by her side; the fingers seem to have originally held a round object, probably a spear. The statuette dates from the early Classical period because of the pose and heavy

⁷⁰ First A. Furtwängler, *Masterpieces of Greek sculpture* (Chicago 1964/1894), 26-34; further G. Lippold, 'Die griechische Plastik', *HdA* iii.1 (1950) 156; Linfert 66-71.

⁷¹ Shield: Akropolis relief inv.no. 2526 Linfert no. 23; statuette in private collection Linfert no. 21; statuette Athens NM no. 3466 Linfert no. 22; Louvre MA 3070 has the shoulder worked out for attachment of the shield. Spear: cf. right hand of Thessaloniki inv.no. 877 Linfert no. 4.

⁷² The head type associated with the 'Athena Medici', the Carpegna head in the National Museum in Rome inv. no. 55051, carries an Attic helmet, which is of course possible for the Pheidian Athena *Promachos* but not confirmed securely by the Group 1 coin images.

⁷³ See for instance the statues in Seville nos. 839 and 840, Linfert nos. 2 & 3; and the statuettes from Elis, Athens NM 3000, Linfert no. 16.

⁷⁴ Thessaloniki inv.no.877, Linfert no. 4, Cyrene cat.no. 14.176, Linfert no. 5, and Ariccia inv.no 19, Karanastassis (n.71) 339 n. 63.

⁷⁵ Caster and stucco worker J. Bau and director, Dr.phil. J. Zahle, at the Royal Cast Collection in Copenhagen, now director of the Danish Institute in Rome.

⁷⁶ On the replicas of Athena Parthenos see most recently Weber (n.19) 83-122 and K.D.S. Lapatin, 'The ancient reception of Pheidias' Athena Parthenos: the visual evidence in context', in *The reception of classical texts and images*. Open University, Milton Keynes, UK, 3-4th Jan. 1996, eds. L. Hardwick and S. Ireland (Milton Keynes 1996) 1-20.

⁷⁷ A comparison with the Parthenon sculpture is instructive, see F. Brommer, *Die Skulpturen der Parthenon Giebel* (Mainz am Rhein 1963) *passim*; Linfert 70, prefers to compare the 'Athena Medici' with Parthenon metope no. S 17 for a date in the 440s. Thereby the Athena *Promachos* would have been almost contemporary with the Athena Parthenos which seems an unlikely conjunction of two such enormous works and one which, most importantly, is not supported by any of the other evidence. Linfert is in other words attempting to downdate the *Promachos* to suit the date of the 'Athena Medici' which is methodologically very dubious.

⁷⁸ I discuss the statue type of the 'Athena Medici' and the many very interesting problems and aspects it raises at greater length in a forthcoming article in *ARID* xxiv (1996-97).

⁷⁹ New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 50.11.1; H: 0.149 m. Langlotz (n.42) 74-5; G.M.A. Richter, *Metropolitan museum. Catalogue of Greek sculpture* (Oxford 1954) 25 no. 29; Mathiopoulos 16.

drapery, c. 475-450 BC. The 'Athena Elgin' has been seen as a work contemporary with and strongly influenced by the Athena *Promachos*; Langlotz and Richter saw this work as a free version of the Athena *Promachos*, and Mathiopoulos is also one of the advocates for the interpretation of the 'Athena Elgin' as being inspired by the Athena *Promachos*.⁸⁰ The owl attribute which is carried by the 'Athena Elgin' cannot be securely supported by the coins of Group 1, but the winged object seen on some of these coins makes this a possibility.⁸¹ In addition, the 'Athena Elgin' wears a heavy peplos, and although she clearly has one leg relaxed and set back, still stands with the whole of the foot set firmly on the ground, an indication of the Early Classical date of this type. The type was popular in vase painting, as well as on decree and votive reliefs, and in sculpture in the round. The identification first made by Langlotz has found widespread support; recently both Ridgway and Demargne have argued for a possible echo of the *Promachos* in the 'Athena Elgin'.⁸² As Ridgway writes, the Athena *Promachos* was not a cult image but a votive offering and one which might have been a preliminary model for the Athena Parthenos. However, there are still elements in the 'Athena Elgin' that make a secure identification difficult: helmet type and the winged object. Neither the Corinthian helmet type nor the owl can be fully supported by the only secure coin representations in Group 1, so this statuette must also be considered as nothing more than a tempting or potential representation of the Pheidian Athena *Promachos*.

To sum up, the Roman coins from the second and third century AD depicting the Akropolis provide us with a general idea of the outdoor setting of the great bronze statue by Pheidias on the Akropolis, which is consistent with the indications given by Pausanias as well as the remains of the foundations of the statue base. The coins also provide a rough idea of the colossal size and general outline of the statue type. This statue was a standing Athena wearing a helmet and probably a peplos. One arm was held forward, the hand carrying a winged attribute, while on the opposite side her spear rested against her shoulder. The shield is only seen a few times and then leaning against the leg of the same side as the spear which makes it likely that it did so in reality. The later epithet of *Promachos* associated with Pheidias' statue suggests a warlike Athena, and this has in turn lent support to a raised shield. This, however, is plainly contradicted by the evidence of the secure coin representations in Group 1. The other related coins and lamps should all be rejected as representations of the great bronze Athena. Further, the Byzantine manuscripts

⁸⁰ See the previous note; Tölle-Kastenbein (n.22) 49-51 no. 8c however, probably correctly, finds there is too little evidence to draw such a conclusion.

⁸¹ The owl as a suitable attribute for the Athena *Promachos*; see Mathiopoulos 25-9. The owl was in general often used as an attribute of Athena in representations of the goddess from the second half of the sixth and early fifth century BC, cf. M.H. Groothand, *BABesch* xliii (1968) 35-51; this attribute is also associated with the Athena Polias, see Kroll (n.41).

⁸² B.S. Ridgway, *Fifth century styles in Greek sculpture* (Princeton 1981) 169; *LIMC* ii (1984) s.v. 'Athena' no. 205 (Demargne).

are of little use, and their value is very limited. There are obvious similarities with the Parthenos, but how great these were in reality and whether or not they were made intentionally is impossible to say. Finally, it is impossible to make a secure identification with a statue type in the round, as indicated above.

Perhaps the more famous Parthenos was so similar to the *Promachos* that it was 'copied' more readily than the *Promachos* in the following centuries. Far-fetched attributions are best avoided and it is only natural that Athens should choose the image of Athena as its symbol on coins and lamps, but to attempt to attribute every single type of Athena found on these objects to a particular statue type is a fruitless exercise.

The problems of attempting to reconstruct the appearance of Athena *Promachos* recur whenever scholars decide in advance that they are going to recover the appearance of a lost original by a famous sculptor by identifying copies, no matter how unsatisfactory the evidence is. A careful analysis of the archaeological, numismatic and literary evidence reveals that none of the candidates so far put forward as a copy or a version of the Athena *Promachos* is convincing or even plausible.

BIRTE LUNDGREEN

Ashmole Archive, King's College London

Cratinus' Διονυσιαλέξανδρος and the Head of Pericles

The hypothesis of Cratinus' Διονυσιαλέξανδρος (*POxy* 663), one of the most important pieces of evidence for non-Aristophanic comedy, raises many problems, some of which, notably the reconstruction of the pre-parabolic plot and the staging problems in the κρῖσις-scene, have received a fair amount of scholarly attention.¹ I propose to look at a feature of this play to which much less thought has been devoted in print, but which, I believe, is central to an appreciation and understanding of it: the significance of costume and costume-change.

The plot of the Διονυσιαλέξανδρος as is recoverable from the hypothesis is, briefly summarized, as follows: Hermes moves off creating actor-free stage for a parabasis of the chorus of satyrs; Dionysus re-enters (line 10 παραφανέντα), which causes the satyrs to ridicule him, presumably because of his new shepherd-outfit. The title of the play, at any rate, suggests that Dionysus dressed up as Paris (cf. *Ran.* 499: 'Ἡρακλειό-ξανθῶας and Kassel-Austin vol. III 2 p. 34). There

¹ To the literature mentioned in Austin *CGFP* p. 35 and Kassel-Austin vol. IV p. 141 add W. Ameling, 'Komödie und Politik zwischen Kratinos und Aristophanes: Das Beispiel des Perikles', *QC* iii (1981) 383-424, P. Lerza, 'Alcune proposte per il *Dionysalexandros* di Cratino', *SIFC* liv (1982) 186-93, A. Tatti, 'Le *Dionysalexandros* de Cratinos', *MHTIS* i (1986) 325-32, G. Bona, 'Per un' interpretazione di Cratino', in: E. Corsini (ed.), *La polis e il suo teatro* ii (Padova 1988) 181-211, esp. 187-94, M. Vickers, *Pericles on stage: political comedy in Aristophanes' early plays* (Austin 1997) 193-5.



(a) Coin with view of the Akropolis from the North (Berlin)



(b) Coin with view of the Akropolis (London, British Museum 1922-3-17-82)



(c) Coin with view of the Akropolis (London, British Museum 1902-12-1-3)



(d) Coin with Athena Polias (London, British Museum BMC Athens 585)



(e) Coin with Athena (London, British Museum 1929-5-15-132)



(f) Coin with bust of Athena (London, British Museum 1855-12-11-24)



(a) Lamp with bust of Athena
(London, British Museum, Q3261)



(b) Lamp with standing Athena
(London, British Museum Q962)



(c) Detail of Byzantine
miniature with Saprikios & St
Nikephoros (location
unknown)



(d) 'Athena Medici'
(Paris, Louvre, MA 3070)



(e) 'Elgin Athena' (New York,
Metropolitan Museum of Art, 50.11.1)