

THE PARTHENON AND ITS SCULPTURES

EDITED BY

MICHAEL B. COSMOPOULOS

University of Missouri–St. Louis



PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2004

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2004

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typefaces Adobe Garamond 11.25/15 pt. and Lithos *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data is available.

ISBN 0 521 83673 5 hardback

| | | |
|---|---|----------|
| | <i>List of Figures</i> | page VII |
| | <i>On Abbreviations and Transliteration</i> | XIII |
| | <i>List of Contributors</i> | XV |
| | INTRODUCTION: THE METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF PARTHENON STUDIES | I |
| | Michael B. Cosmopoulos | |
| 1 | A NEW ANALYSIS OF THE PARTHENON FRIEZE | 5 |
| | Sarantis Symeonoglou | |
| 2 | CLASSIC MOMENTS: TIME IN THE PARTHENON FRIEZE | 43 |
| | Jenifer Neils | |
| 3 | WORK SECTIONS AND REPEATING PATTERNS IN THE PARTHENON FRIEZE | 63 |
| | John G. Younger | |
| 4 | PANDORA AND THE PANATHENAIC PEPLOS | 86 |
| | Noel Robertson | |
| 5 | A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PARTHENON'S EAST PEDIMENT | 114 |
| | Georgios Mostratos | |
| 6 | THE PARTHENON EAST METOPES, THE GIGANTOMACHY, AND DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY | 150 |
| | Katherine A. Schwab | |
| 7 | THE PARTHENON IN 1687: NEW SOURCES | 166 |
| | William St. Clair and Robert Picken | |
| 8 | INTRACQUARRY SOURCING OF THE PARTHENON MARBLES: APPLICATIONS OF THE PENTELIC MARBLE STABLE ISOTOPE DATABASE | 196 |
| | Scott Pike | |
| 9 | CONCLUSION: THE CURRENT STATE OF PARTHENON RESEARCH | 207 |
| | Jenifer Neils | |
| | <i>Index</i> | 211 |

| | | |
|------|---|---------------|
| 1.1 | East frieze, block VI, figures 38–40 | <i>page</i> 7 |
| 1.2 | Block EVI, detail of midsection of E38 | 7 |
| 1.3 | Block EVI, detail of lower part of E38 | 8 |
| 1.4 | Block EVI, torso of E39 | 9 |
| 1.5 | Block EVI, detail from upper part of E40 | 9 |
| 1.6 | Block EVI, detail of middle part of E40 | 10 |
| 1.7 | North frieze, block II, figures 3–5 | 11 |
| 1.8 | Block NII, detail of upper part of N3 | 11 |
| 1.9 | Block NII, detail of lower part of N3 | 12 |
| 1.10 | Block NII, detail of upper part of N4 | 12 |
| 1.11 | Block NII, detail of lower part of N4 | 13 |
| 1.12 | Block NII, detail of upper part of N5 | 14 |
| 1.13 | Block NII, detail of lower part of N5 | 15 |
| 1.14 | Block NII, head of cow behind N4 | 16 |
| 1.15 | North frieze, block IV, figures 9–12 | 16 |
| 1.16 | Block NIV, lower part of N10–11 | 17 |
| 1.17 | Block NIV, detail of upper part of N10 | 17 |
| 1.18 | Block NIV, detail of mid-low parts of N10 | 19 |
| 1.19 | Block NIV, detail of feet of N12 | 19 |
| 1.20 | North frieze, block VI, figures 16–19 | 20 |
| 1.21 | Block NVI, heads of N16–17 | 20 |
| 1.22 | Block NVI, upper parts of N18–19 | 21 |
| 1.23 | North frieze, block VIII, figures 26–29 | 21 |
| 1.24 | Block NVIII, detail of lower part of N26 | 22 |
| 1.25 | Block NVIII, detail of middle parts of N27–28 | 22 |
| 1.26 | North frieze, block IX, figures 30–37 | 23 |
| 1.27 | North frieze, block X, figures 38–43 | 23 |
| 1.28 | Block NVIII, detail of lower part of N29 | 24 |
| 1.29 | Block NX, detail of lower part of N38 | 25 |
| 1.30 | Block NVIII, detail of lower part of N26 | 25 |
| 1.31 | Block NIX, detail of middle part of N35 | 27 |
| 1.32 | Block NX, detail of heads of N39–40 | 27 |
| 1.33 | Block NX, torso of N38 | 28 |
| 1.34 | Block NX, detail of lower parts of N39–42 | 29 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1.35 | North frieze, block XI, figure 44 | 29 |
| 1.36 | Block NXI, torso of N44 | 30 |
| 1.37 | Block NXI, detail of legs of N44 | 30 |
| 1.38 | Block NXI, detail of horse | 31 |
| 1.39 | North frieze, block XIX, figure 58 | 31 |
| 1.40 | Block NXIX, detail of torso of N58 and horses | 33 |
| 1.41 | Block NXIX, detail of horse | 33 |
| 1.42 | Block NXIX, detail of hooves | 34 |
| 1.43 | North frieze, block XXIII, figures 63–65 | 34 |
| 1.44 | Block XXIII, heads of N63–64 | 35 |
| 1.45 | Block NXXIII, torso of N64 | 35 |
| 1.46 | Block NXXIII, detail of middle part of N64 | 37 |
| 1.47 | Block NXXIII, detail of middle part of N65 | 37 |
| 2.1 | Symposium; Attic red-figure volute-krater attributed to Euthymides, <i>c.</i> 515–510 BC | 44 |
| 2.2 | Plan of the Parthenon frieze | 45 |
| 2.3 | North frieze cavalcade with rank leaders | 48 |
| 2.4 | North 105, detail | 49 |
| 2.5 | West 30, cast | 53 |
| 2.6 | West XIII, cast | 55 |
| 2.7 | East VI, cast | 57 |
| 2.8 | Peplos ceremony: East V, figures 31–35 | 59 |
| 3.1 | Pavlos Samios sculpting a frieze based on the Siphnian Treasury | 64 |
| 3.2 | Unfinished Roman sarcophagus, Pergamon | 65 |
| 3.3 | Tombstone of Hegeso | 66 |
| 3.4 | Nereid monument, frieze block 860 | 67 |
| 3.5 | Harpy tomb, west side | 67 |
| 3.6 | Parthenon frieze, North VI/6 | 68 |
| 3.7 | Nereid monument, frieze block 894 | 69 |
| 3.8 | Parthenon frieze, South XVI | 69 |
| 3.9 | Parthenon frieze, North XI/11 | 70 |
| 3.10 | Parthenon frieze, North XII/12 | 70 |
| 3.11 | Parthenon frieze, North XVII/23 | 71 |
| 3.12 | Parthenon frieze, North XXIV/29 | 71 |
| 3.13 | Bassae frieze, British Museum 536 | 72 |
| 3.14 | Bassae frieze, British Museum 530 | 72 |
| 3.15 | Parthenon frieze, West VI, British Museum cast | 73 |
| 3.16 | Parthenon frieze, West XV and XVI, British Museum casts | 74 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 3.17 | Parthenon frieze, West III, British Museum cast | 74 |
| 3.18 | Parthenon frieze, West XII, British Museum cast | 75 |
| 3.19 | Parthenon frieze, West IX and X, British Museum casts | 76 |
| 3.20 | Drawing of West XII over West III | 77 |
| 3.21 | Drawing of West XII over North XLII/47 | 78 |
| 3.22 | Parthenon frieze, North XLI/46 | 79 |
| 3.23 | Parthenon frieze, North XXXII/37 | 79 |
| 3.24 | Parthenon frieze, North XXXV/40 | 80 |
| 3.25 | Parthenon frieze, North XXXVIII/43 | 80 |
| 3.26 | Parthenon frieze, North XLI/46, detail | 81 |
| 4.1 | Zeus, Pandora? Aphrodite or Charis or Hora? Hermes; black-figure neck-amphora by the Diosphos Painter, <i>c.</i> 520 BC | 87 |
| 4.2 | Athena, "Anesidora," Hephaestus; white-ground kylix by the Tarquinia Painter, 470–460 BC | 88 |
| 4.3 | Athena, Hephaestus, Pandora? Fragment of red-figure crocodile rhyton by the Sotades Painter, <i>c.</i> 460 BC, detail | 89 |
| 4.4 | Athena, Pandora, Ares; red-figure kalix krater by the Niobid Painter, <i>c.</i> 460 BC, detail | 90 |
| 4.5 | Charites or Horai, Pandora, Athena, Hephaestus; base of Athena Parthenos from the library at Pergamon | 91 |
| 4.6 | Charis or Hora; base of Athena Parthenos from the library at Pergamon, detail | 92 |
| 4.7 | Kithara, female figure; late Hellenistic relief fragment | 93 |
| 4.8 | Epimetheus, Pandora; volute krater related to the Group of Polygnotus, <i>c.</i> 450 BC, side A, detail | 104 |
| 4.9 | Pandora; south Italian amphora, Owl Pillar Group, 450–425 BC, detail | 105 |
| 4.10 | Epimetheus; south Italian amphora, Owl Pillar Group, 450–425 BC, detail | 105 |
| 5.1 | Parthenon's east pediment drawn by J. Carrey, 1674 | 115 |
| 5.2 | Parthenon's east pediment, preserved figures | 115 |
| 5.3 | Parthenon's east pediment drawn by J. Carrey, 1674 | 116 |
| 5.4 | Parthenon's east pediment, preserved figures | 116 |
| 5.5 | Parthenon's east frieze, central part | 117 |
| 5.6 | Parthenon's east frieze, north group of gods restored by M. Korres | 119 |
| 5.7 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by J. Six, 1894 | 121 |
| 5.8 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by A. B. Cook, 1917 | 121 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 5.9 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by E. Berger, 1959 | 121 |
| 5.10 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by E. Berger, 1977 | 121 |
| 5.11 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by E. B. Harrison, 1967 | 122 |
| 5.12 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by G. Despinis, 1982 | 122 |
| 5.13 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by E. Simon, 1986 | 123 |
| 5.14 | Parthenon's west pediment restored by K. Jeppesen, 1953 | 123 |
| 5.15 | Plan of the pedimental floor, geison blocks 10–18 | 124 |
| 5.16 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by I. Beyer, 1974 | 125 |
| 5.17 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by K. Jeppesen, 1984 | 125 |
| 5.18 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by W. W. Lloyd, 1861 | 126 |
| 5.19 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by A. Furtwängler, 1896 | 126 |
| 5.20 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by I. N. Svoronos, 1912 | 127 |
| 5.21 | Parthenon's east pediment restored by K. Schwerzek, 1904 | 127 |
| 5.22 | Proposed reconstruction of the Parthenon's east pediment | 128 |
| 5.23 | Document relief from Athens representing Athena, Erechtheus (?), and the olive tree, 410/409 BC | 129 |
| 5.24 | Votive relief from the Athenian Acropolis representing Athena and Nike crowning an athlete, c. 440–430 BC | 129 |
| 5.25 | Colossal left hand holding the shaft of a thunderbolt | 133 |
| 5.26 | Main fragment of the head Acropolis Museum 2381 | 135 |
| 5.27 | "Laborde head" | 137 |
| 6.1 | East 2, Dionysos fighting a giant | 151 |
| 6.2 | Parthenon, east facade, with casts of the metopes | 153 |
| 6.3 | Conjectural drawing of left male figure in South 27 | 155 |
| 6.4 | East 6, Poseidon crushing a giant with Nisyros, drawing of extant figures | 157 |
| 6.5 | East 6, Poseidon crushing a giant with Nisyros | 158 |
| 6.6 | View of Nisyros | 159 |
| 6.7 | Fourth century BC Attic funerary relief fragment | 160 |
| 6.8 | East 13, giant attacked by Hephaistos | 161 |
| 6.9 | East 13, giant attacked by Hephaistos, drawing of extant figures | 162 |
| 6.10 | East 13, proposed reconstruction drawing of giant attacked by Hephaistos | 163 |
| 7.1 | Parthenon in 1675, from Jacob Spon, <i>Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant</i> | 167 |
| 7.2 | Parthenon in 1687 by Gravier d'Ortières | 168 |
| 7.3 | Frontispiece from Jacob Spon, <i>Recherches Curieuses d'Antiquité</i> | 169 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 7.4 | Illustration from Edward Dodwell, <i>A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece</i> | 171 |
| 7.5 | View of Athens by an unknown Venetian artist, 1670 | 175 |
| 8.1 | Stable isotope database of major marble-producing ancient quarries in the eastern Mediterranean | 197 |
| 8.2 | Map plotting ancient quarries on south slope of Mount Pentelikon | 199 |
| 8.3 | Geologic map of ancient quarry region on south slope of Mount Pentelikon | 200 |
| 8.4 | Development of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ stable isotope field for Pentelic marble distinguished by distinctive symbols | 201 |
| 8.5 | $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ scatterplot of all analyzed samples from ancient quarries on upper slope of Marble Unit 3 | 202 |
| 8.6 | Scatterplot distinguishing isotope fields within Pentelic quarry region | 203 |
| 8.7 | Scatterplot locating Parthenon sculptural marbles within Pentelic marble database | 204 |

THE METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF PARTHENON STUDIES

MICHAEL B. COSMOPOULOS

Few monuments have excited and fascinated both scholars and the public as much as the Parthenon. Two and a half millennia after its construction, this magnificent building still enjoys enormous popularity and continues to generate important research across a wide range of fields, from classics and art history to archaeology and the physical sciences. Even so, as we delve deeper and deeper into its mysteries, new sets of questions and new problems arise, which require us to keep reassessing and redefining our methodological framework.

The main purpose of the international conference “The Parthenon and Its Sculptures in the Twenty-First Century”, organized by the present writer at the University of Missouri-St. Louis in April 2002, was to create an opportunity for Parthenon specialists to meet and assess the current state and future direction of Parthenon studies. Because awareness of how our own mindframes affect our study of the monument is a *sine qua non* of the research process, the conference focused not only on the presentation of the results of new research but also on the methodological framework currently used in Parthenon studies. The papers included in this volume, all of which were presented at the conference, make it clear that at the dawn of the twenty-first century Parthenon researchers employ a broad framework of analysis that allows us to address new and complex issues about the monument and its creators and to offer original interpretations of already existing problems.

The methodological framework employed in this volume has four main parameters. The first is that it still relies heavily on the traditional, formal analysis of the monument. Inherent in most papers published here is the principle that interpretation can only be based on accurate reading of the evidence; as a

consequence, thorough visual analysis of the physical components of the monument remains at the core of any viable attempt to assign meaning to them. That the results of such efforts may be different and can even contradict each other is a natural outcome of both the gaps in our data and the diverse ways in which each researcher's eyes are trained to view art. For instance, Symeonoglou and Younger, although both rely on meticulous analyses of style, reach different conclusions about the number of artists involved in the creation of the frieze – conclusions which have different implications about the social standing and even the mindframes of those artists. Similarly, Mostratos' reconstruction of the east pediment is solidly rooted in the traditional methodological scheme of earlier research and demonstrates how difficult a consensus on the reconstruction of the missing parts of the monument can be. Some of the conclusions presented in this volume are certainly controversial, but they are nonetheless useful in that they stimulate different ways of approaching the Parthenon.

The second parameter of the methodological framework of the papers published here relates to the introduction of new technologies in Parthenon studies. In an era of rapid technological progress, scholars and scientists must work side by side in order to find new ways of extracting information about the monument. Two papers in this volume illustrate very well how new technologies can open up exciting prospects for the study of the Parthenon and how they can be used to reconstruct some of the missing pieces of the puzzle. Schwab's combined use of digital photography, graphics computer programs, and traditional analysis of related iconography from the visual arts of the period is able to make visible details of the worn surfaces of the metopes that are not immediately apparent, thus improving our understanding of the imagery and its meaning. Pike's use of stable isotope analysis to help identify the quarries out of which the marble of the Parthenon came is an exciting example of the tremendous potential of high technology to enhance our understanding of the monument.

The third parameter is the study of the cultural and sociopolitical fabric out of which the building emerged. This is a thread that is picked up by several authors. Neils' analysis of the organizational structure of the frieze illuminates an important dimension of the political symbolism of the monument for the Athenians of the fifth century, one which relates to the historical development of the unification of the Athenian state. Robertson's examination of the visual evidence in conjunction with the historical sources provides a fresh look into the political realities that may have shaped the iconography of the base of the statue of Athena Parthenos, and it offers an intriguing explanation of the peplos

ceremony at the Panathenaia, namely, that it was an expression of Athenian plans for Boeotia. Younger's study, which he characterizes as an effort to "democratize the sculpting process," is an attempt not only to explicate the process of creating the Parthenon's frieze but also to reconstruct the social standing of the artists who carved it.

The fourth parameter is the diachronic study of the monument. The postclassical history of the Parthenon is currently not only an integral part of research but a potentially valuable source of information about the problems relating to the imagery of the ancient temple. With the publication of a previously unknown manuscript, St. Clair and Picken paint a vivid picture of the Parthenon at the end of the seventeenth century and reconstruct the alterations in spatial organization that the monument underwent through time within the context of its changing functions. The extent to which the early travelers impacted the spread of philhellenism in Europe is well known, and this manuscript adds yet another dimension to the processes by which the European predilection for classical art emerged.

Which brings us to Lord Elgin. In the last few years, the debate around Greece's petition for the restitution of the architectural and sculptural pieces removed by Elgin has been at the forefront of public interest in the Parthenon. Although this often passionate debate has not left Parthenon research unaffected, all scholars agree that above and beyond the controversy lies our need to continue studying and understanding this extraordinary monument. Within this framework, another objective of the St. Louis conference was to promote the spirit of collegiality, scholarship, and international cooperation among Parthenon scholars. Although papers on the "Parthenon" or "Elgin" Marbles and the issue of their return to Greece were included in the conference, they will be published in a separate volume, as in recent years this subject has developed into a subfield of its own. Consequently, the present book includes only the "non-Elginian" papers, if such a term be allowed.

The conference took place in the Millennium Student Center of the University of Missouri-St. Louis and was funded by the Hellenic Government-Karakas Foundation Professorship of Greek Studies at the University of Missouri-St. Louis and the Ministry of Culture of Greece. I would like to express my most sincere thanks to the Minister of Culture, Professor Eleftherios Venizelos, for approving the grant that made the conference possible, and to the Department of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Ministry of Culture, especially Dr. Alkestis Soulogianni, for administering it so efficiently. In St. Louis, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the inspired and unfailing support

given to the Greek Studies Program in general and this conference in particular by Professor Joel Glassman, Associate Vice-Chancellor for International Studies and Director of the Center for International Studies, and by Mr. Nicholas Karakas, Chair of the Board for the Greek Professorship, and also to acknowledge the valuable assistance of Mr. Terry Williams in dealing with the numerous practical arrangements involved in putting on the conference and with any problems that arose. Many thanks are due to Professor Jenifer Neils for agreeing to write the succinct synthesis of the current state of Parthenon research, presented in the concluding chapter of the volume. I am also thankful to Cambridge University Press, especially the Editor for Classics and Archaeology, Ms. Beatrice Rehl, as well as Mr. Zachary Dorsey and the copyeditor of TechBooks, for their help in preparing the volume for the press. Last but not least, my deepest gratitude goes to the speakers, who came to St. Louis and succeeded in enlivening our intellectual lives with their stimulating and exciting papers.