



1900

A study of Aphrodite in Greek sculpture

Jessie Christian Brown
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/mantheses>



Part of the [Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque Art and Architecture Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brown, Jessie Christian, "A study of Aphrodite in Greek sculpture" (1900). *Manuscript Thesis Collection*. 30.

<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/mantheses/30>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Manuscript Thesis Collection at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Manuscript Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

A study of "Aphrodite"
in Greek Sculpture.

Jessie Christian Brown
June, 1900.

Books Consulted.

1. Furtwängler, Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture.
2. Collignon, Histoire de la Sculpture Grecque.
3. Baummeister, Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums.
4. Orskov, Geschichte der Griechischen Plastik.
5. Gardner, Handbook of Greek Sculpture.
6. Tarkell, History of Greek Art.
7. Lübke, History of Sculpture.
8. Perrot et Chipiez - Art in Primitive Greece.
9. Pausanias, Descriptio Graeciae.
10. Plutarch - Essays, Vol I.
11. Schliemann - "Troja."
12. Rayet et Collignon - La Céramique Grecque.
13. Stuart-Jones, Ancient Writers on Greek Sculpture.
14. Harrison - Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens.
15. Dury - History of Greece.
16. Dury - History of Rome.
17. American Journal of Archaeology.
18. Encyclopaedia Britannica - Vol II.
19. The Century Magazine Vol I.

Personal Observation and Notes Made in

1. Athens - National Museum.
2. Rome - Vatican, Lateral, Borghese Museums.
3. München - Glyptothek.
4. Paris - Louvre.
5. London - British Museum.

(4)

A Study of "Aphrodite" in Greek Sculpture.

Though Aphrodite is regarded in Greek mythology as one of the twelve great divinities of Olympus, she is most probably not Hellenic in origin. She was not associated with any of the legendary families of Greece: her favorites were non-Hellenic, and more or less Asiatic in origin; her connection with Cyprus, - her sea-foam birth on the island and her name *Kupris*, - has been thought by many to indicate that her worship was based upon that of the Phoenician *Astarte*, goddess of the heavens, since the worship of Aphrodite *Urania* flourished in those parts of Greece where Phoenician influence was strongest. In earlier times she was worshipped as the spirit of love which brings all phases of life into one harmonious whole; in later times she became the patroness of sensual indulgence, the protectress of *ἑταίρα*. She was also a goddess of victory, equipped with the weapons of Ares. She was worshipped as a soothing influence on the sea, with the name *Ἡΰπνοια*.

In the Spring were her principal festivals, where the Graces and the Seasons accompanied her. She was the

goddess of physical beauty, the mother of Eros, the wife of Hephaestus. She inspired love for herself, as in the cases of Anchises and Pygmalion; or she herself loved mortals, as Adonis and Cinyras, the founder of her worship in Cyprus; or she caused passion between mortals, as Paris and Helen, Phoen and the Lesbian women.

The chief seats of her worship were Cyprus, Cythera, Cnidus, Paphos, Corinth, Thebes, Sicily and Athens. At Cythera she appeared as an armed goddess. In Paphos, the oldest seat of her worship, she was worshipped under the image of a ball or pyramid surrounded by blazing torches. Her chief symbols were the tortoise, swan, goat, don, dolphin and hare.

The Roman goddess Venus became associated with Aphrodite of Greek worship after the time of the kings, having been introduced from Lavinium, Ardea and Gabii where she was connected with the advent of Aeneas into Italy.

In Greek sculpture, (supposed) statues of Aphrodite appear in the first half of the archaic period and continue with increasing frequency until late Roman sculpture, where her statues are merely portraits of some Roman lady of the Court. The following types are

found; (1) the draped type, (2) the half-draped type, (3) nude, (4) armed, (5) bathing, each with various modifications, (6) heads.

I. Draped Statues.

1. "Aphrodite with the dove", Museum of Lyons, (see Colignon I, 190. Figure discovered at Marseilles, belongs to first half of archaic period, 660-550 B.C. Undoubtedly of the Samian school, analogous in type to the "Delian statues". Lower half of body missing; body, arms, head heavy and ungraceful; left arm gone, right elbow curved, hand resting at waist line, supporting a dove. Broad face, archaic smile, prominent cheek bones, hair arranged in flat curls around forehead, falls in curls over shoulders, three on each side; low, plain crown; chiton crosses left shoulder, right shoulder and breast bare; folds of chiton thick and flat, arranged with mathematical precision. Interesting because of date and dove, though ugly.

2. Figure found on Acropolis of Athens. (Gardner I, 115. Lower half of body, left arm, half of right missing; left hand held closely to breast, holding apple(?) (some interpret as Persephone with pomegranate.) Body thin, waist small, thick neck, heavy jaw, flat features; hair marked over forehead by waving lines, block out behind. Chiton folds faintly marked. Probably belongs to Samian school.

3. Relief on a small altar in Athens, National (4
Museum. Of special interest because it is believed to
be a copy of the Aphrodite Sosandra of Attic sculp-
tor Calamis, in the first half of 5th century. (Mon-
kch. I, 279). Gardner I, 236, opposes this theory.
Lucian said that his ideal statue (Imagg. VI)
"should have the modest courtesy, noble unconscious
smile of the Sosandra, and her drapery, save that
her hair should be uncurled." In this relief, fig-
ure is full front, head turned to right. Thin
drapery showing outlines of figure. Features obliter-
ated, hair in long curls, head half covered with
thin veil, left hand holding a fold of the veil.

4. Venus Genetrix found at Trepis, now in Louvre,
attributed by Collignon II, 118-120 to Alcamenes,
pupil of Pheidias, and by Gardner II 506 to
Arcehilus who lived middle of 1st century B.C.
Alcamenes most famous work was the "Aphrodite of
the Gardens" said by some to have had the finish-
ing touches from Pheidias' own hand; reckoned by
the ancients as one of the most beautiful statues
in the world. Lucian takes from it the "round of
the cheeks" and the hands. This so-called Venus
Genetrix was found about the middle of the 17th
Century. She stands, holding in her left hand
an apple and catching in her right hand a
fold of the garment above her right shoulder.
End of garment wrapped about left arm.

Long tunic with out sleeves or belt slips from left shoulder leaving left breast bare, small folds of thin material follow lines of body and limbs; right leg slightly bent, resting on ball of foot. Face round, delicate colour, hair in small curls over forehead and temples and parted down middle. Expression sweet and gentle, eyes bent in worry, lips half smiling. Statue a remarkable study in drapery. For this reason Colignon likens it to "These Fates" or Victory venturing her scandal. Gardner recalls series of Imperial coins having similar figure which was designed for the Forum of Julius Caesar, and compares it with "Electra" known to be by Pasiteles, contemporary of Arcesilaus. Hair archaic, proof of early origin (?)

5. Statue in Berlin Museum. Colignon II, 135. Draped wood. Left leg bent at knee, foot resting on rather high support. Upper part of body in Doric Chiton, slightly slipping off left shoulder, down left arm, which is bent at elbow. Limbs clothed in heavy clinging drapery, second garment folded over upraised left thigh. Urbani restores it with goose under foot, done in right hand, leans left leaning on an archaic idol. Colignon compares its size and drapery with Parthenon figures. Urbani suggests as sculptor Agoracritus, contemporary of Phidias.

6. Statuette from Cornets now in Berlin (Furtwängler, p 71).

Copy of Aphrodite Curania of Pheidias(?). 6
Goddess leaning upon her own image, drawing veil
aside with right hand represented in majestic
repose. Both feet fully on ground, but left slightly
advanced. In one hand is small saucer. Drapery
full, completely covers body, bracelet on right wrist,
face gentle but serious.

7. Statue in the Louvre, considered by Furtwängler,³²³
a poor reproduction of a Praxitelean statue, per-
haps the one which the people of Kos preferred
to a nude figure. Goddess wears long thin chiton
folded about hips in Ionic style. Right shoulder
lowered slightly, garment slips down shoulder.
Leaning attitude characteristic of Praxiteles here
retained, right thrown on right leg, left shoulder
raised, right hip out. Left hand rests up on head
of Eros of Roman origin. Head missing. Drapery very
full, arranged in little folds with truthful precision.

8. Statue No 22, Ephesian Room, British Museum.
Draped torso from Cyrene. Head gone, arms crossed
across front of body, hands laid on abdomen. Thin
folds of garment reveal form. Familiar leaning
type, probably late work, copy of earlier.

Completely draped figures are rarely found after
Pheidias. Greater freedom from artistic conventions,
sensual delight in physical perfection took the
place of austere majestic representations of the goddess.
more of the body is allowed to be seen un-draped.

9. Furtwängler, 378, 379 - a statue in the Palazzo Valentini, Rome, which Furtwängler ascribes to the "generation after Phidias." A figure of rather heavy type, - large form, heavy draperies. Body draped with thin chiton which is almost plain across the body and the left leg, but draped in fine folds the length of the right leg. A heavy himation hangs from the shoulders and crosses the thighs from right to left in heavy folds. Face full, eyes turned upward (resembling Nike head.) Hair thick, parted in the middle, and falling on each shoulder in curls. Decidedly matronly type.

10. Statue in Dresden. Furtwängler 382. Headless figure, left foot resting upon stone - chiton slipping off right shoulder, down right arm, caught with a brooch. Narrow belt below breasts. Loose outer garment hung over left shoulder, passing around figure in the back and crossing upraised left knee. Furtwängler calls this a "late Roman marble variant of the motif of the Melian Aphrodite; in no sense, however, a replica." Also (385, 386) he says "this type had to be used for portraits of Roman ladies, so that a fuller costume was indispensable. All copies when the heads are preserved are Roman portraits."

11. Statue in the Louvre. Escalier Gauche du Daru, No 571. This stately figure is evidently a late copy after Knus Genetrix, as the pupils of the eyes are outlined and other traces of late work. One breast is exposed. The hair is rolled on the forehead like the hair of Apollo Belvidere. The eyes are looking upward.

12. Statue in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens. (Dunay Vol IV, section II, P 451.) It was discovered in Epidaurus in 1886, and is a very beautiful piece of work. The lower part of the legs and drapery is missing, also the right arm below the elbow, and the surfaces are much mutilated, but the beauty of pose and drapery are still evident. A thin chiton reveals the curves of the upper body, falling low on the right arm and revealing the right breast. Over this a himation falls from the left shoulder, covering the entire left side with heavy folds, but falling low on the right thigh. The drapery is exquisitely carved, revealing as it does the bodily forms. Over the right shoulder, passing diagonally across ^{under} the left arm is a strap, buckled at the top of the right arm. Could it have been a sword strap? The face, which is quite mutilated, is grave and tender. The eyes look thoughtfully at some object held in the right hand, very probably a mirror.

The hair wears close to the head and is confined by one fillet. The left hand is raised almost to the shoulder, and ~~partly~~ ^{may have} held a toilet article. Still, if the strap were a sword strap, we might restore the figure leaning upon a shield with her right hand and holding a helmet in the left. The statue is a remarkable piece of work. Collignon II, 463 also pictures this statue and calls it "Aphrodite à l'épée," and restores it with both sword and lance. (See discussion of the armed type.)

13. Louvre, Escalier Gauche du Daver, 276. A small statue, resting her right on her left foot; left hand holds the thick folds of drapery which float out like a shell; right hand back of the head; on top of the head is a roll of hair, and a fillet; eyes wider than usual.

14. Same, No. 155. This figure holds the drapery in the right hand, the other end of the drapery thrown over left arm. The large folds of the drapery protect a small cross standing at the side of the figure. This statue is interesting on account of the drapery, but inferior in work and technique. Both 13 and 14 are evidently of Roman workmanship.

II. Half Draped Type.

7

1. The so-called "Knis of Arles" in the Louvre is assigned by Collignon II, 270 sq. to the period of Praxiteles. Found at Arles in 1651, it was restored by the sculptor Guaidon who placed in its left hand a mirror, in the right an apple. One must correct the restoration of the right hand, making it come close to the head, as if the goddess had just completed 'dressing' her hair and was giving a last look to the mirror. In spite of some exaggerated points due to the copyist, Collignon thinks this to be a work after Praxiteles, possibly the "ex-voti" of Theopis, for which Pnyne posed. The goddess is nude to the waist, from which fall folds of a garment whose end is wrapped around the left arm. The body is rather flat, the breasts small and youthful. (To me, the face is much too old for the bodily forms.) This statue is a new type, a departure from the draped 5th century type. As in the "Gnetrix" the artist did not dare, evidently, to unveil the feminine form, so this half veiled figure paves the way for the entirely nude type, in which Praxiteles afterwards reached the limit of his excellence. More audacious, less religious, the art of the 4th century portrays the toilet of Aphrodite, and this Knis d'Arles ~~marks~~ marks the transition. The face is beautiful,

unconsciously coquettish and rather gran. The hair hangs from the part, is bound by two ribbon fillets, and these fillets terminate in two ribbon "streamers" which fall on either shoulder. This method of arranging the hair is decidedly unique.

2. The "Kneis of Capua" in Naples. (Furtwängler, 385-389) Furtwängler attributes the original of this statue to Scopas, and makes it the original from which all other half-draped types, including the Melos statue, were copied. The figure rests her left foot on a helmet, resting weight of body on the right leg. A plain garment is wrapped around the lower limbs, slipping far down the right thigh, and high on left side. The body is turned toward the left, in order that the shield which she held might not cover the front of the body. The right shoulder is lowered and the right arm pressed close to the breast because the right hand held the lower edge of the shield. The left arm is raised horizontally, as the left hand held the upper edge of the shield. The head is bent to look into the reflecting surface, and the upper torso is nude, because it is this part of the body that the goddess wishes to see reflected. As the shield was of metal, it has left no trace on the drapery.

The bodily forms are beautifully modelled, (9.)
The breasts are small, the head small. The hair
parted as usual, is rolled back from the temples
and gathered into a small knot rather high
upon the head. Over the forehead rests a small
kara. The face is gran and unsmiling, the cheeks
round and full, the mouth small, rather pouting.
In the absence of ^{that} gay coquetry, innocent pleasure
in their own beauty and grace which distinguishes
Praxitelean figures, this statue may be attributed
very probably to Scopas.

3. The "Townley Knas" (Hurtwängler 320, 321.) This statue
in the British Museum from Ostia, is in close con-
nection with the Knas of Ales. The head is decidedly
Praxitelean, probably a later work than the Knas
of Ales. The attitude and action are less constrained,
the free leg is drawn more back; and above all, the
head, which is relatively smaller, is turned toward
the free leg and raised, thus destroying all the
repose and tranquillity of the earlier statue. The
drapery is richer and more agitated, and falls
down lower on the one side. The bodily forms are
rounder, the chest is no longer so broad and
flat, the breasts are larger and closer together,
the navel is deeper, the whole figure more mature.
The motion was certainly identical with that of
the Knas of Ales; the left hand held up a
mirror, and the right may have held some

other toilet requisite. The whole conception lacks the dignity and repose of the other statue; this maiden has a preening, self-conscious look; rejoicing in her own beauty she raises the mirror, and cares not if her mantle slips a little bit lower. This figure is very beautiful and gracious, but has no suggestion of power. Furtwängler says "It seems to me that the Phryne by Praxiteles must have looked just like this, - ideally beautiful and noble, yet different enough from a goddess. The statue of Phryne so famous in antiquity was the one at Delphi, much later than the Theban offering. It is this statue that I imagine was the original of the 'Tomboy Venus':"

4 The so called "Venus of Melos" in the Louvre (Collignon 469 sq. - Furtwängler 367 sq) supposed by almost all critics to be a Venus; in the "Century" Vol I, P. 94, Professor Stillman writes a long article to prove this not a Venus, but a Nike by Scopas, the Nike Apteros of the Acropolis. The consensus of opinion is however that the statue is really an Aphrodite. This well known figure greatly resembles the Venus of Capua in arrangement of drapery, pose, graceful beautiful face. Its bodily forms are also very similar. The position of the arms is of course a fruitful source of contention, and cannot be definitely decided; however, the right arm

11

was pressed closely to the side down to the elbow. Furtwängler 380 proposes a restoration which I think ugly and improbable. (Personally, I think the motif is the same as that of the Capuan figure, - holding a shield and viewing her own reflection.) "A well known passage in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius (I. 742) proves that the shield motif was invented before the middle of the 3rd century B. C." The drapery falls about the hips in almost a horizontal line. This gives the back more serene charm. The face of this Melian Venus is its great charm; calm, almost majestic, yet with kindly eyes and gentle expression; hair parted and waving around the ears till caught in a little knot at the back of the head, from which one lock falls down the neck, the whole head poised beautifully on a straight neck. If, as Furtwängler supposes, the Capuan figure is from the type of Scopas, certainly the Melian is also. The whole figure gives one the impression of maturity, self-sufficiency, majesty which is still benignant.

12

This half draped type became very familiar after the "great period". In all European Museums are numerous copies varying in excellence, of these Aphrodite types. The copyist often changed accessories, changed the pose of the head or leg, but the type remains the same. Gardner II, 484, says that after the fourth century, a sculptor who had not the majesty of Phidias nor the grace of Praxiteles would not have dared to represent the goddess nude. However this may be, we find the drapery getting scantier, the pose more sensuous, until in Roman times the type degenerates greatly in the hands of the copyists. Several famous statues in which the drapery is an interesting study are as follows.

5. The "Venus Anadyomene" in the Vatican.

The goddess is here represented as drying her hair. The right arm raised above her head, holds one strand of the waving hair, the other, bent upward at the elbow, holds another portion. This figure is rather mature, more slender at the waist line than the Melian figure. The drapery is gathered rather tightly across the legs and "bunched" between the knees in front. The drapery is gathered at the top into a rosette. The right rests upon the left leg and the knees are shrugged together as if to keep the drapery from falling. The statue still preserves the ideal

13
character, but the softness of conception of the
masters is absent. (See Baumeister I, 90.)

6. The Venus Urania in Florence (Century Vol I, P. 100.)

This statue shows much the same treatment of
drapery as the Anadyomene. The motion is ^{not} the same,
however. Here the goddess is evidently at her toilet,
as she seems to be pulling the drapery up over
her right hip with the left hand. The right
hand is raised to her head as if she were
putting the "finishing touch" to her hair. Upon
her head she wears a small tiara. This statue
has dignity and an ideal character. I should
place it earlier than the Roman period,
when individual characteristics were more marked.

7. The "Venus of the Vatican" (Century I, 100.) decidedly
shows degeneration. It is almost sensual. The drapery
forms an elaborate background for the beautifully
modelled legs. The drapery is fastened around
the upper thighs, and floats aside and back in
rich folds, leaving almost all the thighs bare.
The goddess holds a strand of hair in her up-
raised right hand, while in the left hand
held in front of the right breast she holds
a small vase of perfume or oil. The figure is
beautiful as is the face; the latter, however, smiles
affectedly and lacks the ideal features.

8. Similar to the latter is Fig 1787 - Escalier Guiche

du Daru of the Louvre. This is only the legs¹⁴
and lower torso. The drapery is wound about the
waist, falls to feet in back, leaving all of the
legs exposed in front. The left hand holds the
folds in place. This figure is from Tripolis.*

9. Small Statue No 185. 3rd Traiano Roman room,
British Museum. The figure rests on right leg, left
lovely bent at the knee. The Drapery is wrapped
around right leg from the middle of the thigh
and falls in loose folds to the ground, leaving
the left leg entirely nude. The face and head
are of the Praxitelean type, but the expression
is not so sweet. The hair wears two fillets. The
arms are probably correctly restored. The left
hand is holding the handle of a mirror.

10. Figure in the Louvre, No 154 Mollin Gallie.
This figure has the same pose as the Melos, with
Roman modifications. The drapery is lower than the
Melos. The body is indifferent, but the head is beau-
tiful, with a fillet and a small knot. The drap-
ery rests on a pillar at the left. a small Eros
on the pillar looks up at some object the figure
holds in her left hand.

* An interesting figure of this type is found
in Duruy vol IV - II - P 503 - called the Aphro-
dite of Syracuse. Head and portion of right
arm are missing. This is evidently a late copy,
as the bodily forms are quite voluptuous.

The Nude Type.

There can not be, of course, such variations in the nude type as in the types with drapery. The only variations in different nude figures can be those of attitude and motif.

Nude figures of Aphrodite do not appear before the fourth century, although she was doubtless so pictured before that in art. The first nude attempts at sculpture found in the island statuettes, etc., may have frequently represented the goddess; but we can not say positively that this is so.

~~See~~ Pausanias V, 10, 2, says that on the throne of the statue of Zeus at Olympia, made by Phidias, was a representation of Aphrodite nude, emerging from the waves. But, in general, we may say that the Praxitelean period marks the beginning of the nude Aphrodite type in sculpture.

I. The Aphrodite of Cnidus must be assigned to the middle period of Praxiteles' art. (see Furt. 322, Gardner 362). The best copy of it is in the Vatican, where it is now disfigured by a bronze drapery. The goddess is represented as preparing for the bath. She is dropping her drapery from her left hand upon a large marble vase, while she leans

to shrink from the exposure of her own
 beauty even in the privacy of the bath." This
 feeling is expressed in every line of face
 and figure, while she is conscious of her
 own beauty and delights in it." (G. 362.) The
 body is soft, yet finely developed, the form
 slender and rounded. The waist line is
 high, the breasts close together. The right arm
 is curved at the elbow, the lower part missing.
 The head is one of extraordinary beauty, small
 and turned slightly to the left; the face is
 raised and the eyes look dreamily forward.
 "In the expression we can realize what
 Luccian meant when he spoke of 'the beautiful
 line of forehead and brow, and the melting
 eye full of joy and pleasure.'" (Gardner 363)
 The mouth has an expression of sweetness, yet
 is not quite smiling. The texture of the hair
 is very different from that of the skin; the
 hair ripples over the ears and is gathered into
 a small knot just at the nape of the neck.
 The spirit of the figure is one of innocence
 and kindness, as far removed from the stern
 majesty of Pheidias figures as from the voluptuous
 figures of late copyists. One can readily
 believe that the Cnidians refused any price
 rather than part with their goddess.

II. Torso in Naples (Furt. 358) This torso
 Furtwängler assigns to Euphranon. The head
 lower legs and arms are missing. The right
~~leans~~ ^{rests} upon the right leg, while the body
 curves toward the left. The breasts are
 small and far apart, the shoulders broad
 and rather flat. Compared with the Cnidian
 figure, this torso's outlines are very inferior.
 The figure is rather voluptuous, and not
 quite pleasing.

III. Louvre, salle X, No 160. A small nude
 torso, very graceful, attitude uncertain, but
 most probably not entering the bath. This
 torso is not at all voluptuous, but delicate.
 It is distinguished by a small twisted ^{collar}.

IV. British Museum, ~~second~~ ^{third} Graeco, Roman
 Room No 197, is a small torso of unusual
 pose. The body stoops over, the right arm
 reaching toward the ground; the left arm is
 gone. This figure was doubtless entering the
 bath. The head has been made of another
 piece and fitted to the neck. The anatomy
 of this beautiful little figure is perfect.

V. The "Frons de Medici" (Gardner 499) This
 celebrated figure is in the Uffizi Gallery in
 Florence. Praxiteles had represented the god-
 des as preparing for the bath with a gesture

of almost unconscious modesty. The attitude of the Medici figure is rather that of affected coyness. The eyes are directed upon a certain spot, doubtless a spectator, of whose gaze she is conscious. It is true that there is not the court unconsciousness which characterizes the Cnidian figure, yet the Medici statue is very beautiful. The position of the hands is objectionable, but they have been restored, and in the original they may have been otherwise disposed. The hair is "tumbled", and gathered into a small knot, as the back of the goddess is a sporting dolphin, down whose back slides a small Cupid. This figure dates from the Graeco Roman period and while very finely modeled, shows the deterioration from the lofty spirit of early nude figures. Colquhoun calls it "the apotheosis of human feminine beauty." (Compare *sculptura Octobri*, 1897, VI. The Capitoline Venus in the Capitol in Rome. (See Photographs.) This beautiful figure much resembles the Medici in pose. The body leans forward rather more, but the positions of hands and head are almost the same. Here, too, the goddess is just about to enter the bath. By her side is a tall urn

on which drops a shawl-like drapery. The hair is unusual in arrangement. In front it is parted in the middle and ripples over the ears to the back of the head, whence it falls in curls down the shoulder. On the crown of the head is a large roll, wider than the head, crossing the head from one side to the other. The face is decidedly womanly, with none of the goddess in it. The whole figure is rather mature, and though very beautiful, shows evidences of its late origin in its degeneration from the early type.

VII, VIII. Escalier Gauche du Salon, Louvre, 305, 336. Two figures with the same motif as the Capitoline figure, with the hair arranged in the same roll. In both figures the jar is replaced by dolphins. On one of these dolphins an Eros stands on the other an Eros slides down the dolphin's back.

IX. Colignon, II, 585, pictures a beautiful and unique statuette in bronze in the British Museum. Unfortunately, much of the body is broken away, but the head youthful and gran, remains intact. The bodily forms are slender and youthful. The right rests upon the right foot, but the left leg, bent at the

knee, is raised high. The upper parts of the body stoop to meet it, and Colignon restores it with the right hand rapidly untying the sandal, while the left arm is thrown up to maintain the equilibrium. The goddess here is doubtless preparing for the bath. There is great beauty and daintiness in the figure, and the head is especially charming. X. The so-called Esquiline Venus (Colignon II 686). This has been commonly accepted as a Venus, but Colignon does not accept this view. He says perhaps a priestess of Isis. Except for its extreme youth, it has all the characteristics of an Aphrodite, in the familiar attitude of preparation for the bath. Both arms are missing but were probably both raised to the back of the head, when she is twisting her hair into a knot. There is a youthful charm about this figure, and a modest shrinking from the exposure of her figure. By her right side is a vase on which hangs a loose garment. The hair is archaic, arranged in regular flat curls across the forehead and bound with a close fillet. The face is grave and thoughtful. Colignon places the statue late in the Roman period.

From these familiar types many statues have been copied, which may be seen in all the Museums of Europe. Praxiteles made his Aphrodites half draped and nude, and accounted for their unveiling by representing them at the bath or at the toilet. Later sculptors went further and represented them nude for the sake of nudity. Two instances of this class are as follows.

1. Furtwängler 381. a delicate bronze statuette in Dresden. The goddess leans with her left elbow on a tall pillar. The left hand loosely holds an apple. The upraised right hand holds a tress of hair. There is no conscious modesty, nor yet coquetry. She is calmly nude, and makes no excuses for her nudity. The figure is beautiful and graceful.

2. Coligny II-279. a bronze statuette in the Habich collection, at Casuel. This ugly little figure is evidently a copy of a famous original called the *Psilouménè*. The goddess is evidently fastening a collar about her neck. If one overlooks the ugly features of this little copy, he may see traces of master workmanship.

A natural step from the Aphrodite preparing for the bath is the representation of her in the bath.

The Bathing Type.

There are few statues that portray the goddess in the bath. Duruy III, 602, pictures a coin of Nikaia having upon it the Venus crouching as in the bath. Collignon II, 584 says "Pliny Nat. Hist. 36, 35 says that Daedalos made a Venus bathing herself." Not the Daedalos of Sicily, pupil of Polykleitos, but a sculptor of Bithynia, created this type. The goddess was represented crouching in the bath, while attendants poured perfume upon her back. Collignon II, 584 portrays one of these figures.

I. The head and arms of this figure are missing. The right knee is lowered, the left raised as the figure stoops low. Collignon calls this a "beautiful marble" and calls attention to the care of its execution; but to the ordinary student, this figure lacks beauty and dignity. There are no fine lines; the figure is ungraceful in pose, and realism is carried too far. For instance in the rolls of flesh across the side and the swelling muscles on the inside of the left thigh. The foot and toes are too prominent. A small hand, probably that of Eros, remains on the back. Collignon restores it with the left hand on the knee, the right to the breast.

In the Salle des Caryatides of the Louvre are two figures of this type, almost exactly alike. (Nos. 1354, 1305.)

In the Salle de Coyzeux, Louvre, is an interesting figure, the torso copied exactly after these figures, the head beautiful, half turned aside, the hands crossed over the breast. This figure is beautiful in itself and modifies the unpleasant impression made by the headless and mutilated figures mentioned.

II. Hall of the Masks, Vatican - No 427 - is a "Crouching Knus" of this type. The head, turned toward the right, the arms folded over breast and abdomen.

The Armed Type.

This type is extremely rare, and very interesting as representing the goddess of Love in armor. We know ^{that} she was worshipped as Ἀφροδίτη ἠπλοζεύη in the Peloponnese from the following references.

Plutarch, Customs of the Lacedaemonians.

Pausanias III - 15, 10. III, 23, 1. III, 17, 5. VIII, 9, 6.

Strabo VIII, 379.

Mackail's Greek Anthology, Section 4, No 39.

She was also worshipped in connection with Ares. - Pausanias I, 8, 4. II, 25, 1.

Apollonios Rhodios, Argonautica I, 742.

I. The Aphrodite of Epidaurus - (see Pp. 6 & 7 of this thesis) undoubtedly wears a sword strap across the right shoulder. This would certainly place her in the "armed" class, as her beautiful drapery entitles her to a place in the study of full draped figures.

II. No 370. Escalier Gauche du Dan - a nude Aphrodite removing her armor. The goddess here has laid aside her helmet, and a small Eros at her side is trying it on his head. The goddess un buckles the sword strap on her right shoulder. This is a beautiful slender figure, with youthful form and small breasts. The face is gran, the hair is pinned closely to the head. The best example of the armed type I have seen, though this is evidently a Roman copy of an earlier figure. Compare Baumeister vol I P 623 - also I, 93.

III. Ephesian Room of the British Museum - No 21. is an interesting statuette of which the head is missing, also left arm. The body rests its right upon the right leg and leans against a pedestal on which are parts of a drapery, a shield and a spear. The right arm is lowered to meet the upraised left leg. The hand was probably taking off a

gran, while the left arm probably leaned upon the pedestal for support.

The cultus of the armed *Kuros* was, according to Furtwängler, pre-Dorian. It flourished in unattainable Laconia, so that it is not surprising that so few remains of the armed *Aphrodite* in sculpture are left.

(In the Louvre, in the collection of Roman portrait statues and busts, is a group of "Mars and *Kuros*", portrayed by a Roman lady and gentleman of high rank. We may argue from this, that they were posing after some famous group.

Heads and Busts of Aphrodite.

There are in European museums many beautiful heads, having unmistakable evidence of *Aphrodite* heads. The general features which characterize these heads are (1) oval contour, (2) long eyes rather narrowly opened, (3) sweet expression of mouth, (4) hair in simple waves, usually bound with a fillet, (5) a head rarely set "squarely" on the shoulders, but gracefully bent to one side or the other.

The principal points of difference are (1) age, whether youthful or matronly, (2) expression, whether smiling or grave, dignified or coquettish.

I. Baumeister's Denkmäler, vol II P. 1087.

An Aphrodite head from Olympia. This head while not altogether pleasing in some respects, shows advanced progress, evidently made in the beginning of the "great period." The cheeks are very full, the mouth small, the eyes prominent. The full neck is a touch of unexpected realism. The hair is roughly ground. Yet the whole head is important and interesting as an early example of what became the accepted Aphrodite features.

II. Closely allied to the above head in style and appearance is a beautiful but mutilated head from the S. slope of the Acropolis.

(Gardner II, 418) Collignon II 248.) This head bears, it seems to me, unmistakable traces of Scopas. The face is simple and oval in form, with a mouth half open, showing the line of the teeth; the eyes are rather wide open, with a passionate expression, set deeply under the brows. The cheek is full and firm. The hair is bounded with a fillet, which does not allow the hair to escape over the forehead, but lets it fall down over the ears. "The inflated nostrils, as well as eyes and mouth, seem to show a passionate nature in repose. Here the head, simplicity and dignity are most impressive." The whole head

no evidences of master workmanship:
 and, far removed as it is from Praxiteles,
 seems closely allied with the Tegean heads
 of Scopas. To him I would attribute this head.
 (Furtwängler P. 67, 68, Figs. 20 B, 21 B. A
 certainly head, whose type Furtwängler attributes
 to Pheidias. This head is half of a double
 seen in Madrid. The face is turned squarely
 toward the spectator. The chin is rather
 heavy, the mouth full, the expression grave.
 The fillet allows no hair to escape over the
 forehead, but the curls break out over the
 ears, and fall over the shoulders in archaic
 style, two long thin strands on either shoulder.
 The arrangement of the fillet over the
 forehead gives a serene cast to the face, as
 curls there would give a softer line." Thus
 we may claim to have recovered an Aphro-
 dite from Pheidias. It has the majestic and
 elevated beauty, combined with winning
 softness of expression; a goddess still,
 not a mortal woman with feelings and
 desires, as Praxiteles was to conceive her."

The head in the Leamfield Collection - (Furtwängler
 3-5 - 346) which Furtwängler proves to his own
 satisfaction to be an original head by Praxiteles,
 his favorite goddess, and a product of his
 earlier period. This head is in two pieces and

has originally placed on another statue, possibly of inferior marble. Furt. says, 343, that nothing is worthy to be compared with this, least except an original such as the "Hermes". The hair is deeply drilled, and has the effect of natural hair, gathered into a small tuft just above the neck, and loosely bound with a fillet. "A breakage behind each ear shows perhaps where a ribbon hung down, as in the "Hermes of Arles". The face is oval, with a "high triangular forehead", an expression of great earnestness, "limpid" expression of eyes, rounded chin with a dimple. The head is unmistakably Praxitelean, and very "appealingly" beautiful. Furtwängler proves it an original by the technical peculiarities of its carving.

▼ Furtwängler. P 390, - a head in the Palazzo Caetani, Rome. This head bears traces of ^{the} both influence of both Scopas and Praxiteles; Scopas, in its strength and gravity, Praxiteles in its grace and sweetness. The hair is pinned closely to the head in the back and confined in front with a plain band. The head greatly resembles the "Hermes of Capua" even that it has far more strength and expression. The eyes are gazing thoughtfully down; hence the upper eyelids are rather prominent."

- VI. Collignon - II - 477. A beautiful bronze head in the British Museum. (See also Plate XI, British M. catalogue) This head was found in Armenia, at Erzindjân, and was evidently wrenched off a large statue. A hand, holding drapery was found with it. The eyes had been inlaid with some vitreous material. The head is in a broad, noble style, yet wholly womanly. The soft hair has been crowned by a tiara, and falls in curls down the neck. The dilated nostrils, calm features and intense expression remind me of a Scopas head. The tiny curls on the forehead are unusual. I do not agree with Collignon ^{to} ~~as~~ the "sexual fulness of the cheeks." There is nothing sexual about all the head; rather pæthos is expressed.
- VII. Furtwängler, 393, a head of "rich strong beauty," attached to a Juno in the Capitol, bearing unmistakable proofs of Aphrodite; a mature face, with earnest upraised eyes, beautiful hair, noble expression. From a Scopasian original.
- VIII. Furtwängler, 397, a beautiful head from Tralles, in Smyrna. This face is very youthful, the expression so sweet as to be almost vacant. The head is decidedly inclined toward the left. The hair is "Hellenistic"; ~~xxxx~~ I do not agree with Furtwängler that it is Scopasian in character.

In the British Museum are several beautiful heads; the finest ones as follows. (1) Mausoleum Room, No 11, an Aphrodite from the Pountalis collection. This is a broad, noble head, with great sweetness of expression. The hair ripples back from the low forehead and is confined in a loose knot. This noble head gives me the same impression as does the Melos figure: repose, dignity, majesty, combined with gentle benignity. (See photograph.)

(2) Ephesian Room, No 29, heroic head with traces of coloring on face and hair; noble type, back of head cut away as if for a helmet.

(3) Second Graces-Roman Room, No 137 - large head, heavy in style; waving hair brought low over temples and ears, falls down the neck in loose curls.

In the Louvre the following heads are notable. Salle X - no number. A small beautiful head of Parian marble; head bent toward ^{the} left, end of nose and chin gone. Beautiful hair, arranged like the Cuidos; peaceful expression, small ears.

Escalier Gauche au Daru - an undoubted Aphrodite head - bust of colored marble, but head (ancient) of white marble; expression very sweet; hair arranged in a roll like the Apollo Melodius.

American Journal of Archaeology, second series, vol I, No 3, p. 241 - a beautiful Aphrodite head found at Gortyna in 1896. This head Praxitelean in style, probably dates from the 4th Century. The head is typical, languid, head of neck, half closed eyes, sweet expression. This head came from Crete, where the English school is making excavations, and is the last addition to the Aphrodite collections.

Conclusion.

After making this study of Aphrodite types, my conclusion is as follows. Up to the time of Scopas and Praxiteles, the sculptors represented the goddesses as majestic and powerful, divine; then the feeling of the artist became the religious sentiment, and soft feminine statues representing the fairest types of physical woman were produced. As the public morals declined, and no return was made to previous religious ideals, this latter type prevailed and suffered degeneration in the hands of copyists. In Roman days, the dissolute court women posed as Venus, and these figures lack any element of divinity, and often lack physical perfection. I think there is no doubt, that Aphrodite was the favorite subject of sculptors.

In vase paintings she frequently appears; in reliefs she is met with frequently; and as we have seen, single figures in the round are very numerous, and must have been made in great numbers in the artistic periods of Greece and Rome. This is a significant fact also, that very few of these Aphrodite figures, whether nude or draped, are offensive and sensual; and in almost every case, we may impute the sensuality of those which do offend, to the copyist who catered to a degenerate taste. For the most part, the statues of Aphrodite represent perfect physical types of woman, combined with gentleness, sweetness and innocence; The kindly influences of love and harmony ^{have been} embodied in marble or bronze by men of genius and reverence.

Jessie L. Christian Brown.

Butter College,

June, 1900.

MA. Thesis

(BA 1897)