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ABSTRACT

Numerous copies of both the Medici and Capitoline Aphrodite were produced in the Roman period. Judging only from the number of copies, it is generally accepted that the Capitoline was the most popular type followed by the Knidia and finally the Medici. First an examination of the copies, variants and quotations of each type is given to provide some background on the Medici and Capitoline.

Next is a discussion of the dating of the pieces which has typically ranged from the fourth to the first centuries BC. An overview of a second century trend is presented to place both pieces in the second century, followed by a comparison of the Medici to the Telephos Frieze on the Great Altar of Pergamon and other known second century pieces such as the work of Damophon. This theory points to a second century date for the Medici and contradicts the recent scholarship of Christine Havelock who would assign the pieces to the first century and Julie Salathé who would place the pieces more broadly in the fourth to second centuries.

Lastly, a discussion of the statue types found on Roman coins will shed light on where the original Medici type stood. These coins were issued at Nikopolis ad Istrum in Lower Moesia, Deultum in Thrace, Amasia in Galatia, Saitta and Philadelphia in Lydia and Megalopolis in the Peloponnesse.
CHAPTER ONE

NUDITY AND THE KNIDIA

Before an examination of the Medici Aphrodite or the Capitoline Aphrodite can commence, it is crucial to understand what preceded it, both historically and artistically. Since it is an accepted fact that the Aphrodite of Knidos by Praxiteles was the inspiration for both the Medici and Capitoline Aphrodite, that would be the logical starting point. In addition, most scholars have no problem accepting Pliny’s stated floruit of 364–361 (HN 35.49–52) for Praxiteles as a date for the Knidia, so the fourth century would be the rational place to start.

Greece of the fourth century continued to be plagued by warfare, although what the modern world calls the Peloponnesian War officially ended in 404. By 386 The King’s Peace, as the treaty was called, meant that the Ionian colonies were under Persian control once again. The Athenian artist, Kephisodotos, created Eirene and Ploutos sometime after 374. While Kephisodotos’ piece was more in keeping with the traditional peplophorus of the fifth century, other artists continued the exploration of wet drapery, prevalent in the late fifth century.
Examples of this wet drapery can be seen in the akroteria and pediment sculpture from the Temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus, ca. 370. There are also similar figures from Athens.²

In the mid-fourth century, the Athenian naval alliance was dissolved, shattering any hope Athens had of reviving her fifth century maritime empire. Then Athens, allied with Thebes, was defeated by Phillip II of Macedon in 338. When Philip died two years later, his son Alexander assumed the throne and set out to conquer the Persians. The artist Alexander chose to do his official portraits was Lysippos, who produced at least five. This brings us past the time of the Knidian Aphrodite.³

Because Greek art is so well known through Roman copies and also because the Greek and Roman worlds intermingle in the Hellenistic period, a knowledge of Roman history will also be helpful in this examination. Rome spent most of the fifth century fighting the Etruscans, who had ruled during the seventh and sixth centuries. In the fourth century, Rome was defeated and sacked by the Gauls, but by the beginning of the third century Rome had secured the land surrounding the city of Rome and controlled most of Italy. They also dissolved
the Latin League at this time. Contact with Greece increased so that early in the third century, the worship of Asklepius was introduced. However, by the second century, under the leadership of conservative leaders such as Cato, Rome was reacting against the Hellenization of its populace. Bacchic Rites were suppressed early in the second century and, by 150, Greek philosophers were expelled from Rome not once but twice. Amidst all this war, the Romans failed to produce the monumental works of art that Greece had under similar circumstances. It may be that none of the work survives (as much of Rome was destroyed when the Gauls sacked the city in 390) although, unlike the Greeks, the Romans did not have a long history as either artists or, at this point, connoisseurs of art.  

By the second century, the Roman Republic had moved beyond the Italian peninsula and was conquering different areas of the Mediterranean, carrying away local art work as spoils of war. It was during this period that Rome acquired its love of Greek art. Art that is typically called Republican art or even Etruscan art was produced, not in the early Republic, but as late as the third to first centuries. An Etruscan piece like the Mars of Todi
is usually dated to the fourth century while the Capitoline Brutus is dated from the fourth to the first centuries. Although Rome had contact with Western Greek colonies (in addition to Etruscans and other native people in Italy) since its early kings (Syracuse was founded 20 years after the traditional date of Rome’s founding), it was during the Hellenistic creative period that whatever might be called a “Roman style” finally coalesced. Rome also shared Greece’s preoccupation, however overly romantic, with the glorious past of Greece.

Having a general idea of what was taking place in the Greek and Roman world in the fourth and fifth centuries, this discussion can now turn to more specific consideration of what would have led up to the Knidian Aphrodite. The piece is often referred to as the first monumental nude of a female Olympian deity, but the full implication of that is rarely understood. While the nude male was the preferred alternative to deities in the fifth century the female nude never completely disappeared from Greek art. While more typically limited to erotic scenes in classical vase painting there are also some female nudes found in sculpture. Female nudes had their beginning in the archaic period with pieces
like the ones that Blinkenberg recognized as the earliest versions of the Knidia motif (Fig. 1.01 and 1.02). In actuality, the figures are in the pose of the Medici and Capitoline.⁶

Another relevant nude female from the Archaic period is the Canicella Goddess from Orvieto. Although found on Italian soil, the piece was most likely made by a Greek
artist, as nearly all later Roman Imperial art would be. The piece is certainly an anomaly in the ancient world, and alone among all the nude females in either sculpture or the minor arts of vase painting or gem engraving she has a groove to divide her labia, although the area still lacks any pubic hair. The remains of the proper right hand and position of what remains of the arm on the torso seem to indicate that she was holding an object against her belly, above her genitalia. The reconstruction offered by A. Andren suggests that her proper left hand was between her breasts so she was not in the pudica pose but was very close.⁷

Another figure with a motif that was very close to the pudica motif is a clay plaque found in Corinth but of Syrian origin.⁸ A piece like this indicates that a motif close to the pudica pose was imported from the east. This long-standing tradition of Goddesses touching themselves may indicate why Knidus and an Eastern Greek audience in general were so receptive to a nude figure of Aphrodite and to one that was in a pose that had been transformed from a ritual one to a more natural one.

The presence of the nude female in sculpture although really used in public art only in the archaic period was hardly something sprung unprecedented upon an unsuspecting audience.
Although never at the forefront of the art world, the female nude was always present, first finding expression in religious motifs and finally becoming an acceptable mode of artistic expression. Thus, Bernoulli’s late nineteenth century theory that half-draped nudes were created first to prepare the audience can be dismissed as an outdated theory, without the feminist language employed by Havelock. Boardman calls the Knidia a “crucial innovation,” and “aesthetically a profound innovation”. She is actually the beginning of female nudity as an accepted subject for public statuary, and as such is both a profound innovation and a crucial innovation in the history of western art.

Lastly, it may seem that a nude Aphrodite is a departure from nude mortals seen in classical vase painting or an isolated piece like the Niobid from the Gardens of Sallust, but the Knidia is a merger of such female nudes with an Aphrodite figure like the Venus Genetrix, whose wet drapery and exposed breast leave little to the imagination. Additionally, while the Knidia may be an innovation, it is also the logical evolution from religious or ritual figures of the archaic period, erotic vase paintings and the sensuous Venus Genetrix of the classical period.
Next, we turn from a general history of female nudes to literary references to the nude Aphrodite. With Pliny as our primary source for information on Greek artists, an examination of his work might reveal some information about nude Aphrodite figures, although he was not contemporary with the pieces themselves and was writing about sculpture already three hundred years old. In addition to the famous marble Knidia that Praxiteles created, Pliny mentions that he made a bronze Aphrodite. All we know of the piece is that it was destroyed when a temple burned down in the reign of Claudius some four hundred years after its creation. Pliny calls it “the worthy peer of his famous marble Aphrodite.” (HN 34.69) This is probably the piece that early scholars such as A. Hauser, J. Sieveking and W. Amelung were thinking of when either the Medici or Capitoline were attributed to Praxitiles or the fourth century. (Stewart notes that Praxiteles actually made five Aphrodites, including the Knidia.)

Other scholars like A. Furtwängler attributed the Medici or Capitoline to Kephisodotos, son of Praxiteles, who also made an Aphrodite of stone. Pliny tells us this statue was in the gallery of Asinius Pollio in Rome (HN 36.24). Being in such a prominent place and being the product of an artist from a prestigious family of artists, one would imagine that the piece
was copied. It well may have been copied, but in chapter three we shall eliminate at the very least the possibility that the Medici was created in the Late Classical period.

Another fourth-century sculptor, Skopas, made a marble Aphrodite to go with Pothos (HN 36.25). However, we are not told if this Aphrodite is nude, draped or semi-draped. Since the Pothos has some drapery and leans inward somewhat, we might assume that the Aphrodite that accompanied him would have had some type of drapery, whether her body was exposed or not. We might also assume that she would probably lean in the opposite direction although all of this is uncertain. These conjectures also do not agree with Stewart’s hypothetical reconstruction which has her fully clothed, seated and positioned as the central figure. 12

In addition, no numismatic evidence has come to light suggesting that the Medici or Capitoline were grouped with the Pothos. The coins do suggest a winged Eros or Ares, but not a figure, winged or unwinged, in the pose of the Pothos. The coins bearing the Medici, Capitoline and Knidia will be examined in detail in chapter four.

Skopas also made another marble nude Aphrodite “which surpasses even the Praxitieles goddess” (HN 36.26). Which
sculpture Pliny had in mind is unknown. Pliny may have also just been repeating what he read in a now lost source. The passage about a piece surpassing the Knidia is problematic and outside the scope of this paper. If we were to judge based on which type was copied more often in the Roman empire (Pliny wrote in the Julio-Claudian period of the Roman empire), the Capitoline would seem to be the most likely candidate. This is probably why in 1971, Brinkerhoff suggested a reexamination of the evidence of Skopas as the artist responsible for the Capitoline. Since my focus is the Medici, this is not something that I will address fully, though I will briefly give some reasoning for thinking the Capitoline was created after the Medici whether it was a decade after or centuries after.  

Lastly, Pliny mentions a marble Aphrodite by Philiskos of Rhodes (HN 36.35,) an artist of whom we know nothing. Pliny makes no mention of dates for the artist, and never says if the Aphrodite is nude or clothed. The only other evidence of an artist with this name is a signed base but the signature is not definitely the same Philiskos. This artist and any relationship to the Medici and Capitoline will be more fully addressed in chapter three.

By looking at isolated instances of the pudica pose, that occurred in the Archaic period and then the Late Classical
Knidia, we see that the Medici and Capitoline are a motif that took roughly four centuries to come to fruition. The pudica pose did not simply end with the Medici and Capitoline but continues to be reused and reinterpreted up into the twenty-first century. The Knidia was one step in the process and was certainly the catalyst for the Medici and Capitoline, but the Medici and Capitoline were the springboard for the pudica pose that remains imbedded in the psyche of western art. In reviewing Pliny’s account, we see that the Knidia was certainly not the only nude Aphrodite made, although she is most likely the initial sculpture that Praxiteles’ contemporaries imitated. These imitations survive only in the words of Pliny, who was reporting on them some three hundred years after their creation. Any one of these creations could have led to the Medici. After examining some copies, variations and quotes of the Knidia, Capitoline and Medici, this thesis will focus on placing the Medici in the second century and then consider for what area of the Greek-speaking world she was created.
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CHAPTER TWO

COPIES, VARIANTS AND QUOTES
(HYBRIDS, PASTICHES AND MOTIFS)

Under the Roman Empire many copies of Greek sculpture were created. In some cases these copies are the only evidence left of the original sculpture. Looking at these copies will not only teach us about the ancient copy industry but about the Knidia, Medici and Capitoline types.

A theory put forth by M. Marvin about copies is that Roman patrons only required that sculpture be appropriate for the space the patron was decorating. She continues by saying that the primary concern of most Roman patrons was locale and “...creating a special kind of atmosphere.”

Marvin even quotes Vitruvius, the Roman architect of the first century A.D., who tells us that athletic figures were appropriate for gymnasiums and philosophers or orators were the appropriate subject matter for forums.

According to Marvin, since Roman patrons were not interested in exact copies but only that the piece be recognizable as an athletic figure or something appropriate for a gymnasium styled after the Academy (herms of Herakles, a herm of Athena or Muses but not Maenads as is inferred from letters), one consequence was varying degrees of faithfulness
to a sculptural type. While it may be true that not every patron wanted an exact copy, Marvin never offers an explanation for the different demands of patrons and never differentiates between the different types of copies. In addition, Marvin never mentions the existence of pointed copies. The casts of Baiae, the remaining points on a piece like the Lancellotti Discobolus, and closely matching measurements on copies prove that there was some sort of demand for exact replicas. If we consider how many exact copies do exist and that those copies are only a portion of what survives, it is difficult to believe Marvin’s assertion that a Roman patron was always only concerned about location and mood rather than exact copies. When Marvin talks about Cicero’s lack of interest in exact copies she never entertains the idea that such an expense might have been beyond his resources or more likely he only wanted to spend a certain amount of money on art, despite his insistence that price was no object. If someone was a connoisseur of art and an Emperor, like Hadrian, he would spend more money in order to obtain an exact copy and if someone like Cicero was only interested in decorating a villa less elaborately than Tivoli, he may have only wanted sculpture that was recognizable (as with a loose copy or quotation) but not necessarily an exact copy. Hadrian’s concern was the art itself while Cicero’s concern was art as interior
decoration which are separate and distinct demands. Whether considering the demand of Roman patrons or attempting to reconstruct the original type, it is the individual pieces within a “replica series” (by which I mean all the copies, quotations and variants of a particular type) that must be examined.

One means of sorting through copies is by expense which can be measured in man-hours of work and the quality of materials used. First there are expensive copies which would be pointed copies and very careful freehand copies. Next there are copies that might be expensive or mid-priced but are made for architectural niches and lastly there are the least expensive, garden sculpture and souvenir or small “votive” figures which are all generally smaller in scale and as such qualify as quotations rather than copies. Since there is no literary evidence on the amount spent on any of the copies we will be examining I will only describe the pieces as very carefully executed or very careful, painstaking or meticulous copies.

The next means of dividing copies is by copy, variant and quotation. Before proceeding to sort through the various versions of the Knidia, Medici and Capitoline, some terms should be defined. “Type” refers to the original piece as it
would have been recognized by the ancients. Since often the piece no longer exists we can only determine how they recognized the piece by the copies that remain. The best definition of “Copy” is provided by A. Claridge. Although neither she nor B. Ridgway agree that the definition applies to the sculpture of the “Classical world” for my purposes the definition is the clearest and most complete one found. So a copy then is “… an attempt to reproduce in form, style and execution the work of a given artist, so that the reproduction may stand in the place of the original work as an exact replica for the education and instruction of the viewer …”\textsuperscript{19} Copies may not always be accurate in the style and execution of the original but most importantly a copy does not deliberately depart from the original. Quite often reproductions were produced with a pointing process; however, this is only possible when the original is made of bronze. There are also very carefully executed freehand copies which might involve using measurements or a grid system like that which the Egyptians used. The words close and loose or careless are used to indicate how accurately the copyist has adhered to the type. A loose copy will not match the type in proportions or in the positioning of the body or various angles. “Quotations” preserve the original type but are not necessarily meant to be exact in the details but simply to
have a piece that has enough elements so the viewer will recognize the type being quoted. The most relevant example would be the various portraits of Roman matrons as the Capitoline type which substitute a portrait face rather than the original type’s face. Small scale reproductions of a type and images on coins (or any two dimensional representation of sculpture) are also considered quotes because they differ from the original in size or medium but are meant to be recognizable as the type. “Variants”, though still recognizable, differ from the type in pose, an additional prop or some key element that in effect creates a different type that may take on a life of its own. Adding drapery to the Knidia would make it a variant.

The Aphrodite of Knidus or “The Knidia”

The best way to begin sorting the Aphrodite types is to start with copies, variants and quotations of the Knidia. And the place to start is with copies that are the closest to the original type. The most photographed piece is the Colonna copy in the Vatican collection (Inv. 812) although the Belvedere copy in the Vatican (Inv 4260) is also discussed by scholars. In the Colonna copy one can see the basic elements of the type which include the head turned slightly to the proper left, the weight on the proper right leg, the right hand covering the genitals and the left hand holding drapery that covers a vase.
Although typically used to illustrate the type, the Colonna copy is not particularly sensitive and seems to combine a hard edged academic approach with an attempt at a romantic quality. The Colonna copy is quite competent and is markedly more feminine than the Belvedere copy. However when one compares the Colonna copy to the Louvre torso (figure 2.01) one immediately sees the difference between a very close copy and a competent copy meant for an architectural niche which is where the Colonna copy is appropriately displayed in its home at the Vatican. The Louvre torso area has no strut on its hip or leg which indicates that the artist was skilled enough to conceal any supports and probably used the drapery as the only means of support. Additionally the area between the upper thighs is carved more deeply on the Louvre copy and the lower portion of the navel is carved more subtly.

Next are two heads that seem to be very close to the original type. The first figure in the National Museum, Athens (Figure 2.02) has a very crisp treatment to the surface, a careful well studied treatment of the hair and even the presence of a Venus ring, a fold or wrinkle in the flesh of the neck found only on women. The hair that falls from the hair gathered into a bun is not present on all copies but was likely part of the original type judging from a copy like this which looks to
Figure 2.01
Copy of the Knidia, Louvre Paris.
Photo courtesy of Prof Patricia Lawrence.
be a meticulous if academic copy. What is worrisome is how far
down the hair seems to grow on the neckline although this may
simply be a problem that arose from copying from artwork rather
than copying from nature and demonstrates that the artist may
have been an excellent copyist rather than an artist who has
worked directly from nature.

The second close copy is one found in the Ny Carlsberg
Glyptotek in Copenhagen (Figure 2.03). With so little of the
facial features left it is the treatment of the hair that we are
left with to make observations. There are extra wisps of hair
that come out from the hair line right in front of the ears. The
Figure 2.03
Copy of the Knidia, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, (Inv. 1459). Photos courtesy of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
hair on the back of the neck falls along the neckline in a more natural manner on than the piece in the National Museum Athens which has hair that looks like it is growing from the neck. A view of the back of the piece shows that there is less careful carving in the back indicating that that piece was most likely designed to be put in a niche.²²

Another close copy is the Borghese head in the Louvre (Figure 2.04) The hair along the neck seems to fall down the neck rather than grow from the neck as with the head in the National Museum Athens but does not have the extra hair that

![Copy of the Knidia, “Borghese Head” Louvre, Paris. Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence](image-url)
escapes the bun falling further down. The lips on this piece are parted but not smiling although the piece as a whole is less academic than National Museum Athens and is apparently a close copy of the original type.\textsuperscript{23} There is also an excellent handling of the hair which springs out against the flat band that holds the hair in place.

Another copy in the Louvre (Figure 2.05 and 2.06) smiles a little more than any of the other examples and is probably a fairly close copy. Like the Borghese head it has hair that seems to be genuinely held down by the ribbon and springs out on either side of the ribbon. There are also what appear to be wisps of hair in front of each ear as with the Copenhagen head although there is an irregularity and indefinite quality to them that would seem to be in the spirit of the mid fourth century in that they are taken from direct observation rather than a formula.

Most copies of the Knidia do not show the loose strands of hair falling down the back of the neck as with the Copenhagen and Athens copies. There is even one copy that has a bun that is really a blunt pony tail that terminates in curls. None of these differences in the treatment of the hair need to have been deliberate departures from the original type but rather misinterpretations by the artists who most likely had not seen
Figure 2.05
Copy of the Knidia, Louvre, Paris
Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence
the original firsthand. Since the difference is not intentional the pieces can still be called copies.24

The extra strands of hair on the back of the neck and in front of the ears may even have been painted on either the copies or the original Knidia.

Next to consider are some examples that are a little more difficult to interpret. Was the artist intentionally changing the type? There are four examples and all are headless but have very neat corkscrew curls on the neck. The full size piece is in the Museo Nazionale Romano (Fig. 2.07) and there are three

Figure 2.06
Copy of the Knidia, Louvre, Paris.
Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence
small-scale versions. Two of these small scale pieces were discovered in Athens. (Fig. 2.08 and 2.09) A third small scale example is a fragmentary piece in the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore, MD, whose finished height must have been right around two feet (ht of fragment is 19.72in) although the curls are severely damaged. All three of the small scale pieces are quotations because of their size. One of the two in Athens stood not quite two feet (the headless torso is 15 inches) and has the addition of drapery. (Fig 2.09) The position of her body and legs is similar to the Knidia, but does not match identically; therefore, the piece is a quotation of a variant of the Knidia because of the added drapery. The piece could also simply be called a variant or a small scale variant. The other piece in Athens (Fig. 2.08) is not quite 8 inches and has the remains of a strut very low on the leg.

If my speculation that the copies with the hair falling down the back of the neck are closest to the original Knidia type is correct then these neat curls may be a misunderstanding on the part of the copyists responsible for these pieces. These examples demonstrate the difficulty in classifying copies, variants and quotations. Do we call the pieces with the curls copies, copy-variants, or variants? Although I favor the term “copy-variant” for these particular pieces, the term “copy” can
Figure 2.07
Copy of the Knidia, Museo Nazionale Romano.
Photo from Knidia [Figure I-23 (10)]
Figure 2.08
Quotation of the Knidia, found in Athens. Photo from "The Sculpture" Hesperia 2 no. 2 (1933) (Figure 4) National Museum, Athens Inv. No. 265-S 59

Figure 2.09
Quotation of variant of the Knidia, found in Athens. Photo from "The Sculpture found in 1933", Hesperia 4 (1935) (Figure 20) National Museum, Athens Inv. No. 6211-S 346
be correctly used, if we believe that the artist simply did not see the original and was not intentionally taking liberties with the Knidia type.

Another statue formerly in the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington DC is a copy in spite of the head being different than that of the type (Figure 2.10). While in the pose of the Knidia, there are not only tendrils of hair falling over the shoulders but also a stephane on her head. The piece is obviously meant to be the Knidia, but the artist who made it thinks that some patron will not mind the addition of the stephane and hair on the shoulder. The shape of the face and the proportions of the upper legs are not consistent with the type which more than the addition of the stephane and extra locks of hair make the piece a loose copy.

A carelessly carved variant can be seen in the Museo Nazionale Romano, formerly in the Terme di Diocleziano (Fig. 2.11). The piece shows the proper left hand still holding the drapery but the drapery has been wrapped around the body to be held by the proper right hand in front of the pubic area. The piece also has rather thick ankles and blocky drapery similar to the Syracuse Aphrodite.

Still another variant is a small-scale piece found in the Walters Art Museum. (Fig. 2.12). In addition to the added
Figure 2.10
Loose copy of the Knidia. Formerly in the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Wash DC. Formerly in the collection of Sir Moses Ezekia (known there as "Venus Sallusti") Photo from Greek & Roman Sculpture in America (fig 137)

Figure 2.11
Variant of the Knidia, Museo National Romano, Formerly in the Terme di Diocleziano. (Inv. No. unknown) Photo from Knidia (Figure 6)
drapery, the left arm is lifted slightly to support the drapery. Since this fragment is a little more than a foot tall (12.24 in) it is a quotation of a variant or we can call it a variant or a reduced variant. This variation of the Knidia type is taken one step further in a piece that could be called a pastiche, the Venus Felix in the Vatican Collection (Figure 2.13). This particular variation of the Knidia with the arm lifted to support the drapery and the proper right hand holding the drapery in front of the genitals has taken on a life of its own and is known as the Venus Felix type.

One of the best examples of the Venus Felix is seen in a piece in the Vatican. This particular copy of the type is the one for which the type is named, based on the inscription (Venere felici sacrum Sallustia Helpidus d(omo) d(edit). It has what may be a portrait of the younger Faustina, with a stephane and hair on the shoulders. These characteristics – the stephane from the Capua, the hair on the shoulders like the Capitoline, and the pose of the Knidia – are all attributes that patrons throughout the Mediterranean associated with Aphrodite or Venus.

Lastly there are numerous small-scale copies properly called quotations that vary in quality. The first example found in the Walters Art Museum in not even 10 inches tall (9.52 in)
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Figure 2.12
Small scale variant of the Knidia. Marble with traces of red paint on drapery, possibly from Egypt, The Walters Art Museum (Inv. 23.86) Photo from Hellenistic Art in the Walters Art Gallery (Figure 33). Used with permission of The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, MD.
Figure 2.13
Venus Felix, Museo Pio Clementino, Vatican. © Scala / Art Resource. Photo courtesy of Art Resource
and although severely pitted is an exceptional piece that one
likes to assume captures the spirit of the original. (Fig. 2.14)
In actuality, the success of the piece is independent of
whatever fame or elegance was present in the original Knidia. A
significant detail is that the strut is missing, which tells us
the artist who created it was not working slavishly but
attempting to replicate the spirit of the piece, and furthermore
understands that the strut is not necessary in a piece so small,
although the piece does not have the extra hair falling down the
back of the neck.

In contrast, there is a second small-scale example that
retains the strut. It lacks the elegance that we presume was
characteristic of the original. This is most evident in the
proportion of the thighs and the rather small, fragile looking
feet. Whether or not a quotation of the Knidia has a strut is
not a reliable indicator of how well executed the piece is as
can be seen in the next few examples.

Two more quotations of the Knidia can be found in the
Louvre (Figure 2.15). One of bronze and one of marble complete
with a strut. The pieces are not as charming as the Walters
piece but are still competent quotations and preserve the
primary elements of the type, namely the hand covering the pubic
area and the stance. What changes from one quotation to the next
Figure 2.14
Quotation of the Knidia, possibly from Sidon. Walters Art Museum (Inv. 23.98). Photo from *Hellenistic Art in the Walters Art Gallery* (Figures 19.1 and 19.2) Used by permission of The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore MD.
Figure 2.15
Quotations of the Knidia, Louvre, Paris.
Photos courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence
is the position of the proper right hand and arm as it grasps the clothing. A significant element of these two quotations is the formulaic treatment of the drapery which seems to occur frequently in these small scale copies.

A half-size statue, the so called Venus de Clerq in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, CA. (Inv. 72.AA.93) is an exceptional quotation. Extreme care was taken in its execution, although like the marble figure in the Louvre (Fig. 2.15) it has a strut. The head closely matches the Colonna copy and the Kaufman head although the eyes have been carved out, probably for inlays, and the drapery is handled well. The folds of drapery are more studied and mimic nature more than the two examples in the Louvre which have a set pattern. The drapery of the Malibu piece is also done more carefully than the cursory treatment of the Walters quotation (Fig. 2.14) It also has extra hair down the back of the neck that is really just a rectangular block and is not divided into neat little curls. This coupled with the fact that the back of the drapery is not finished like the Walters quotation might mean that the piece was designed for a niche or a garden. At just over three feet (38.26 in) the piece is the largest of the quotations discussed. The hair on the back of its neck also lends support to my theory that the original Knidia
had hair that fell down the back of its neck as seen with the earlier examples.

**The Capitoline Aphrodite**

Next we move on to copies of the Capitoline type. (Fig. 2.16) The type differs from the Knida type in the weight is primarily on the proper right leg, the proper right hand covers the genitals and the proper left hand covers the breasts, and the hair brought up in a bow-knot. What distinguishes the Capitoline from the Medici type will be discussed a little later. (Also compare Fig. 2.16 and Fig. 2.17) The Capitoline type outnumber copies of the Knidia and the general interpretation of the great number of Capitoline copies is that she was the most popular piece among Roman patrons. Popularity, however, depends largely on time and locale. In contrast to the popularity of the Capitoline in the ancient world and even in the Medieval and Renaissance periods, the Aphrodite of Melos is quite popular in the modern western world, but to the ancients she was not as popular as the Capitoline.  

The best copy of the Capitoline is the head found in the Louvre. (Fig. 2.18) The soft treatment of the face to mimic flesh and the hair which is less linear and more plastic than any other copy tells us that extreme care was taken with the modeling. The eyes are somewhat flat and the entire eye socket
Figure 2.16
Figure 2.17
seems shallow but otherwise the piece is an exceptional copy.

Another head in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Fig. 2.19) was found in Gabii, and found nearby was a torso that is also in the museum (Fig. 2.26). The two pieces were formerly joined. L. Caskey thought the top of the head was modern, although C. Vermeule disagrees. The nose, lower lip and part of the chin are restorations. If we compare the piece to the Louvre head we see that the Boston head is more academic but is

Figure 2.18
Head of the Capitoline Aphrodite type, Louvre, Paris
Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.
Figure 2.19
Head of the Capitoline Aphrodite type, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Photo from Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Catalogue of Greek and Roman Sculpture (Fig. 79 in 1925 edition and Fig. 167 in 1976 edition) Used with permission of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
sill a well executed piece. If we compare the Boston piece to
the Dresden head (Fig. 2.20 or the Louvre head, we see more
exquisite drill work in the very corner of the lips which adds a
coyness to the smile that is lacking in either the Louvre or
Dresden head. However, the Boston head lacks the two curls on
the front of the hairdo, as seen on Louvre head, the Dresden
head and a head on a complete figure found in the National
Museum, Athens, formerly in the Hope collection. (Figure 2.21)
The Boston head does represent the inside corner of the eyes
more delicately, something that is lacking from the Dresden
head. Lawrence considers the Dresden head closer to the original
type of the Capitoline, although he gives no reason. 31

If we compare the Dresden head to the head of the Hope
Aphrodite, we see more similarities in the shape of the area
above the eye and the hair. Since I believe the Hope Aphrodite
is a pointed copy of the Capitoline, we see that perhaps
Lawrence was correct. The two curls of hair on the proper left
side of the head match as well. Although we see that the Boston
head, Dresden head and even the Hope head all have a hard edged
treatment to the hair that is not present in the Louvre copy.
All four of these pieces are from well executed copies with the
Louvre head having the softest, least academic treatment and the
really only shortcoming of the Boston head is that the artist
Figure 2.20
Head of the Capitoline Aphrodite type, Albertinum, Skulpturensammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden
<www.skd-dresden.de>
Figure 2.21
Head of the Hope Aphrodite, National Museum, Athens. Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.
may have paid more attention to the subtle curl of the lip and not to the small curls of hair.

Looking at the head of the Capitoline name piece, we see that the lips and smile are very different from any of these other heads. (Fig. 2.22) The Capitoline has fuller lips that are not smiling and are only very slightly parted. The name piece also lacks any curls at the front of the hairdo like the Boston copy. Although both of these differences can be explained by the practice of padding to prevent undercuts, it is unusual that the name piece would lack these particular traits which would seem basic elements of the type. This tells us that unlike the artist who created the Louvre head, Dresden head or Hope Aphrodite, the artists responsible for the name piece and the Boston head did not have detailed drawings or first-hand knowledge of the type to augment the casts he was working from. Whether or not these artists could reproduce the details exactly they were still producing rather painstaking copies with the Louvre head being the least acadmeic and the Hope copy almost surely from a pointed copy as we shall see when we look at the torso of the piece.

Moving on to full torsos of the Capitoline type, a fragmentary example in Dayton, Ohio could be either a pointed copy or a very careful freehand copy (Fig. 2.23). The narrow
Figure 2.22
Head of the Capitoline name piece, Capitoline Museum, Rome. Photo from Antikensammlung Erlangen Internet Archive. <http://www.phil.uni-erlangen.de/~plaltar/aeriahome.html>
rounded shoulders and the slight uneven position of the breasts matches the Louvre copy (Fig. 2.24), as well as the name piece from the Capitoline museum. Also of interest is what remains of the thumb, which closely matches the placement of the fragment on the Syracuse. We shall examine why this is significant a little later.

One example formerly in the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Fig. 2.25) has a torso that is elongated in the upper section, which might make the piece a loose copy; however since the piece doesn’t match the type in the shape of the shoulders it could be called a quotation. Is the piece a quotation of the Capitoline or the Medici? I believe that this particular piece does not specifically quote either but instead is a generic piece that quotes the pudica motif. Another interesting point to make is that the navel is more rounded than triangular. This feature, like the elongated upper torso, is quite possibly a product of the time in which this copy was produced.

Another example with a rounded navel is a different piece currently in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Fig. 2.26). In spite of the round navel, this piece more closely matches the type seen in the Dayton and Louvre copies. The breasts do seem smaller but the proper left one is lower. With the proper right
Figure 2.23
Copy of the Capitoline, Dayton Art Institute, Dayton OH, Museum purchase with funds provided by Mr. and Mrs. Ralf Kircher, 1986.112. Photo montage from *Greek and Roman Sculpture in America* (Figure 139) Used with Permission of Dayton Art Institute, Dayton OH.
Figure 2.24
Capitoline Aphrodite, Louvre, Paris
Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.
Figure 2.25
Quotation of the Capitoline, formerly in the collection of the MFA, Boston. Photo from *Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Catalogue of Greek and Roman Sculpture* (1976 edition) (Fig. 183)
Figure 2.26
Copy of Capitoline, MFA, Boston. Photo from Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Catalogue of Greek and Roman Sculpture (Fig. 80 in 1925 edition and Fig. 166 in 1976 edition) Used with permission of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
shoulder missing it is a little difficult to tell but judging from the shape of the proper left shoulder the piece is a Capitoline. The shape of the hips and buttocks help in the identification since they match the ones of the Capitoline name piece. The match is not an obvious one, but present nonetheless. This would make the piece either a very careful freehand copy or another pointed copy. Furthermore, this piece has the remains of a dolphin support. All the copies of the Capitoline seen thus far have had the dolphin support rather than the vase, which is typically associated with the Capitoline because of the name piece.

Before continuing the discussion of full length copies of the Capitoline another matter must be clarified. How is one to distinguish between copies of the Capitoline and copies of the Medici? Which characteristics differentiate one type from the other? There are four key elements that differentiate the two aside from the size (the Medici name piece is 5.01 ft and the Capitoline name piece is 6.33 ft), namely the hairdo, shape of the face, the shoulders and shape of the buttocks and hips. The shape of the navel is something that does not seem to help in differentiating the Medici from the Capitoline type although Brinkerhoff attempted to trace a chronological sequence based on the shape of the navel. Since a navel carved deeply enough
might produce an undercut the shape of the navel will usually
depend on the quality of the copy and how much the copyist knew
of the original type.

The hair on the Medici has a less obvious bow-knot and has
a bun which seems to always be present. Next is the shape of
the face. The Medici had a broader face while the Capitoline has
a face that is more oval and longer although both possess the
triangular shape of the forehead that is derived from the
Knidia. The shoulders of the Capitoline are more rounded than
those of the Medici. If one were to get caught up in the
nineteenth century game (which continued late into the twentieth
century) of guessing which figure is more shamed by her nudity
it might be the Capitoline which appears to be more hunched over
more because of the rounded shoulders. In contrast the Medici
has her shoulders held out firmly and proudly. My concern is not
shame but distinguishing one type from the other and the
shoulders of the Medici are not rounded like the Capitolnies’s.
The shoulders also give a fair indication of the position of the
arms. The Medici’s broader shoulders have arms that jut out
more. In contrast the Capitoline’s rounded shoulders would hold
the arms closer to the body. In addition there is quite often
the remains of a thumb on the proper left breast just a few
inches away from the nipple.(Figs. 2.23 and 2.30) This fragment
The best example of a piece where the hips and buttocks match the Capitoline type is seen in the Syracuse Aphrodite. When looking at the Syracuse Aphrodite from behind, one is immediately struck by the similarities of the shape of the buttocks to that of the Capitoline. (Fig. 2.27 and 2.28) Clearly the Syracuse is a variant of the Capitoline.  

The link between the two pieces can be seen in the Hope Aphrodite (Fig. 2.29) which was discovered in Baiae, famous for the cast studio discovered there. Since the extra drapery is required only for stone, we can theorize that the drapery that makes the piece a variant might be a direct result of the casting process of the original bronze of the Capitoline although that might suggest a date as late as the Empire for the creation of the Capitoline. The drapery was, in turn, replaced
Figure 2.27
Backview of the Capitoline Aphrodite name piece, Capitoline Museum, Rome. Photo from Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age. (Figure 35)
Figure 2.28
Backview of the Syracuse Aphrodite, Museo Archeologico, Syracuse. Photo from Ancient Copies (Figure 234)
Figure 2.29
The Hope Aphrodite, National Museum, Athens. Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.
Figure 2.30
by dolphins, vases and erotes, and on occasion the supports were used in combination.

Although the Syracuse is a variant of the Capitoline it takes on a life of its own and there are quotations of the Syracuse such as one piece found in the Stettiner collection in Rome. The piece has both drapery and a dolphin but is carved less carefully and the drapery is rather blocky. The lower legs are thick and blocky, as is the proper left hand. The piece does have tendrils of hair on the shoulder, which are oddly missing from the Syracuse. So the Stettiner piece is a quotation but not a very expensive one. In contrast there is another piece of higher quality that has no hair on the shoulders or back, like the Syracuse. This piece, formerly on the art market in NYC, has the same triangular belly button as the Capitoline and a face that is long and narrow like the Capitoline but the shoulders are not as rounded and are closer to those of the Medici. Does this mean the piece is a variant of the Syracuse? Or does it mean that like the Syracuse, it is a variant of the Capitoline? Should we call the piece a “hybrid,” because the shoulders are more Medici than Capitoline? I will classify the piece as a quotation of the Syracuse because it appears to be a direct reference to the piece but has taken some liberties with the type that go beyond incorrect proportions.
While there are several small-scale versions in bronze that have the pudica motif, the only small-scale bronze that can properly be called a quote of the Capitoline is a piece formerly on the art market (Fig. 2.31). She wears an armlet on her upper arm, similar to the one on some versions of the Knidia. Although details like this are interesting and probably attributes common on Aphrodite figures in general they are not necessarily specific to the original type. The face has the same general oval shape of the Capitoline’s face, although the features do not match exactly. This is hardly expected in a version only 7 1/2 inches tall. The lower legs are a little spindly and the one remaining foot is not very well defined, but otherwise the piece gives us a fair indication of how the original Capitoline type appeared in bronze without the addition of a dolphin, vase or drapery.  

The Medici Aphrodite

Turning now to the Medici type there are several heads to consider. The first example is the Minturnae or Naples head (Fig. 2.32), which Felletti-Maj lists as a copy of the Medici (cat. no. 25). The piece at first hardly seems to follow the type, although the hairline does follow a straight line from temple to ear, as noted by Brinkerhoff. What is more convincing evidence is the shape of the hair bound at the back
Figure 2.31
Quotation of the Capitoline, formerly on the Art Market.
Photo from <www.sothebys.com> (Sale Date November 07, 2001, Lot Number 302)
Figure 2.32
Minturnae or Naples head,
Copy of the Medici type.
Photo from "The Road to Empire I",
Scientific American (Figure 3)
of the head and the small curl at the front of the head, which matches both the Florence (Fig. 2.33) and the New York (Fig. 2.34) copies. The line of the Naples forehead and nose also matches that of the Florence copy (Fig. 2.33), although the Naples copy lacks the depth and fleshiness around the corner of the mouth and the corner where the nostril meets the cheek. In addition, the chin on the Naples head protrudes slightly more. In spite of these differences, the piece matches so closely in other respects that I believe it to be a close copy of the Medici.

Next, there is the head that Felletti-Maj considered a separate step in the progression from Knidia to Medici and Capitoline – the Munich head (Fig. 2.35). Although she elaborated on the theories of previous scholars, she is still discussing the piece as if it were a product of the fourth century. Regardless of the date, the piece still resembles the Medici more than either the Knidia or the Capitoline: the width and shape of the face are not identical, but the head is not as elongated as that of the Capitoline type. The piece also does not capture the “foamy” look of the hair, but does have three small curls, while the New York copy has two (Fig. 2.34). In spite of the hair curling in the opposite direction, I believe it was an attempt on the artist’s part to mimic the original
Figure 2.33
Head of the Medici name piece, Uffizi, Florence. Photo from Antikensammlung Erlangen Internet Archive
<http://www.phil.uni-erlangen.de/~plaltar/aeriahome.html>
Figure 2.34
Figure 2.35
"Munich Head", Staatlich Antikensammlungen. Photo from Hellensitic Art (350-50BC) (Page 302)
Medici type as closely as possible. The shape of the lips do not match exactly, but the curl of the lips is a very close match and the lips are not parted like those of the Capitoline type. Areas such as this, which contain possible undercuts, are often padded, as the hair would have been. Rather than thinking this is a separate step I believe the Dresden head is more likely from a loose copy of the Medici or more likely a quotation, closer to the type than most quotations.

Another head that is probably from a freehand copy is a head from Tomis (Fig. 2.36). The piece has the broadness of the face and a very general similarity in the shape of the hair, although it lacks the tiny curls on the forehead and the head is not as triangular as the Medici or Capitoline types. Again, the shape of the lips do not match exactly, but there are similarities. With freehand copies or even pointed copies in which the artist never saw the original piece and had no detailed drawings to work from, such discrepancies will arise.

We turn now to the full-figure sculpture of the Medici. The Aquileia torso (Felletti-Maj cat. no. 3) (Fig. 2.37) matches the Medici in the shape of the shoulders, position of the breasts and the articulation of the stomach and triangular navel, although Felletti-Maj says the piece is smaller and the proportions do not match. The piece may be smaller than the
Figure 2.36
"Tomis head", Museul de Arheologie, Constanta. Photo from The Dacian Stones Speak (figure 8.15)
Figure 2.37
Copy of the Medici, Museo Archeologico di Aquileia.
Medici but the proportions do seem to match, although the articulation below the line of the belly is not as intricate as in the Florence or New York copy. This gives the appearance that the area from the navel to the public area is longer. The proper right arm may be slightly thinner, but this hardly means that the proportions are nothing alike.\textsuperscript{42}

A full-scale copy is found in the Tauride Venus, housed in the Hermitage (Fig. 2.38). This is a copy that Felletti-Maj (cat. no. 17) and Bernoulli (cat. no. 16) catalogued, and which Farnell discusses briefly.\textsuperscript{43} The body is definitely more Medici than Capitoline in the shape of the shoulders. However, there is hair on the shoulders, as with the Capitoline. As already seen with the Capitoline copies, the support is interchangeable and in this case is the vase with drapery seen with the Capitoline name piece. The face seems to resemble neither Medici nor Capitoline, and may well be a restoration. Felletti-Maj lists a “testa restaurata” as a separate entry (cat. no. 18), although it is unclear if the restored head has been attached to the torso. Bernoulli mentions that the poorly-restored arms were removed and that the head has been replaced, but again it is unclear if the head is a complete restoration or was found near the torso. The arms had been removed by the time Farnell saw the piece, and he makes no mention of the restoration of the head.\textsuperscript{44}
Figure 2.38
“Tauride Venus” (Copy of the Medici) Hermitage, St Petersburg, Photo from <www.hermitagemuseum.org>
Since the pattern of the hair – if not the texture – seems to match that of the Florence and New York copies, I will assume at this point that the head on the Tauride Venus does belong with the torso. With the extra hair and a face that does not match the type the piece might be called a loose copy but with a body that matches the Florence and New York copies so closely I believe the piece is a pointed copy that took some liberties with the type’s face and hair.

The New York and Florence copies (Fig. 2.39) match so closely that they must surely be pointed copies. Aside from the restorations on the Florence copy, it has been polished, which is missing from the New York copy; this suggests that, originally, the Florence may have lacked the polish as well. Because the New York and Florence copies match to such a high degree, they must have been copies that were made by artists with access to the original bronze Medici type.

Another pointed copy is found in Washington, DC, in the National Gallery (Fig. 2.40). It has more space between the breasts, which can easily be explained as a variation resulting from reassembling the casts. A copy in the North Carolina Museum of Art has more variation. (Fig. 2.41) The breasts are not quite the same size and the body is not delineated as well, although it appears to match the Medici type closely. The North
Figure 2.39
NY and Florence copies of the Medici. Left: Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Right: Uffizi, Florence (name piece). Photo montage from *Hellenistic Sculpture I* (Plate 179)
Figure 2.40
Copy of Medici, National Gallery of Art, WAshington DC, Photo from Hellenistic Sculpture I (plate 180a on left and 180con right) Used with permission fo the National Gallery of Art.
Carolina copy may not be a pointed copy – although, if not, it is a careful freehand copy. If a pointed copy, it could have been hastily or carelessly finished, which would explain why the subtle variations in the flesh are not present. These two pieces are the two most recent additions to Fellitti-Maj’s list, although there were four copies that were listed as being on the art market at the time the article was written.

Lastly, there are even more derivatives of the nude Aphrodite which all started with the Knidia (Fig. 2.42 to 2.46). None of these pieces have enough traits in common with any of the discussed types, and should therefore be considered independent types. One of the most interesting of these is the Aphrodite of Cyrene (Fig. 2.42 and 2.44), which at first appears to be a mirror image of the Medici, based on the shape of the shoulders. The piece stands too upright, although this could be easily explained by the reassembly of the parts of the casts or a deliberate change in the pose which would make the piece a quote of the Medici. However, the shape of the breasts and navel and general differences in the articulation of the flesh lead us to believe that the piece is an independent creation, created possibly in the first century BC. There are the remains of hair or a finger on the proper left arm on one copy (Fig. 2.41), and just above the proper right breast on another copy.
Figure 2.41
Copy of the Medici, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, NC. Right photo from North Carolina Museum of Art (Page 55) Left photo from Greek and Roman Sculpture in America (Figure 140) Inv. No. G.69.34.1 Used with permission of the North Carolina Museum of Art.
Figure 2.42
Copy of Cyrene Aphrodite, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh NC. (Inv.No. 80.9.1. Photo from North Carolina Museum of Art (Page 56) Used with permission of North Carolina Museum of Art.

Figure 2.43
Copy of Cyrene Aphrodite, Formerly in the Terme, Rome. Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.
Figure 2.44
Nude Aphrodite, formerly on art market, Photo from Christie’s Advertisement in Apollo (July 1999, Page 19)

Figure 2.45
Nude Aphrodite, Santa Barbara Museum of Art, Santa Barbara, CA. Photo from Greek and Roman Sculpture in America (Figure 142).

Figure 2.46
Nude Aphrodite, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond VA. Photo from Greek and Roman Sculpture in America. (Figure 143)
A further investigation of the Cyrene type is probably in order. The other pieces are identified only as Aphrodite, simply because of their nudity. The piece formerly on the art market (Fig. 2.44) was probably created in the second century BC, while the other two (Fig. 2.45 and 2.46) were probably created in the first century BC. The Santa Barbara piece, (Fig. 2.45) which is bent over and holds drapery, may be a rather flamboyant quotation of the pudica variant formerly in the Museo Torlonia. The last figure in the Richmond, VA museum (Fig. 2.46) shares similarities with the Cyrene and the Venus Felix, and is a pastiche derived from the Knidia. These pieces and others in the later first century and throughout the Roman Empire continued to be produced, borrowing elements and reinterpreting the pieces in many different ways.

The last piece shown (Fig. 2.47) has the general pudica pose derived from the Capitoline or Medici, although she resembles neither exactly and the weight is on the proper right leg like the Knidia. This pudica motif, which originated with the Medici and Capitoline, continued in figures like this piece in the Louvre and then the motif continued well into the Renaissance.

In 1873, Bernoulli listed ninety-nine Aphrodites in the pudica pose, separating them by their support (or lack thereof).
Figure 2.47
Bronze Pudica Aphrodite from Sidon, Louvre. Photo from La Venus de Milo et Les Aphrodites du Louvre. (Page 62)
In 1950, Felletti-Maj sorted through the list, made some additions and finally produced a list of thirty-three copies of the Medici and 101 of the Capitoline. Of the thirty-three Felletti-Maj listed, I have only examined nine copies of the Medici, adding two other ones that may or may not be the copies listed in her article as being on the art market, and adding the head from Tomis. Of these nine, the three heads are from freehand copies and five are pointed copies – one of which might have a very different head with hair falling on the shoulders. If the head really does belong, then the three freehand heads could very well also belong to copies which also had pointed bodies, although this is not something that can be proved.

By wading through the various copies and variants of the Capitoline and Knidia, we see that the Knidia produced just as many variants as the Capitoline did; this is in comparison to the Medici type, which only yielded pointed or freehand copies. There are also numerous small-scale copies of the Knidia, more than were produced of either the Capitoline or Medici. These small-scale copies may be the result of not being able to produce pointed copies of the piece. I can only identify one small-scale Capitoline and none of the Medici (excluding the Aquilla torso). For the most part small-scale pieces only repeat
the motif of the pudica pose, rather than any specific trait of the Capitoline or Medici type.

Lastly, I do not support Brinkeroff’s theory that the Medici is a hybrid of Knidia and Capitoline. He theorizes that the Medici combines the pudica pose of the Capitline with the hair of the Knidia. While the ribbon and chignon are similar to the Knidia, borrowing isolated elements from the Knidia is not enough to qualify the Medici as a hybrid. The only piece that truly qualifies as a hybrid is the Crouching Aphrodite of Rhodes which combines the Crouching Aphrodite type with the Aphrodite Anadomene type.\textsuperscript{50} I do however concur with Felletti-Maj, Havelock and Salathé that the pudica motif had one archetype and that either the Medici or the Capitoline is a variant or an outgrowth of the other the same way the Syracuse is a variant of the Capitoline.\textsuperscript{51} With so many similarities in the two types it is difficult to believe that two separate sculptors made too independent creations so similar, either at the same time or at different periods. As was seen many variants grew out of one type and since the Capitoline was the more popular it is more likely that the Capitoline was a recreation of the Medici who only seems to have appealed to art connoisseurs. If some Latin speaking patron wanted a piece that was “more Greek” than the Hellenistic Medici an artist could
easily have altered a few elements to produce the Capitoline while keeping the basic pudica pose. Conversely it could have been an artist that came up with the idea of making some minor adjustments to the Medici to make it more marketable. Once created the Capitoline took on a significance and life of its own, independent of the Medici and so became established as a separate type just as the Venus Felix and the Syracuse become separate types.

Boardman calls the Medici and Capitoline Hellenistic variants of the Knidia; I do not think that the repetition of a motif makes them variants of the Knidia any more than Canova’s Venus Italica is a copy or a variant of the Medici. This is also true of the tinted Venus by Gibson, which is not a mere copy or variant of the Knidia. Both nineteenth-century pieces most definitely drew on inspiration from the Knidia, Medici and Capitoline types, but they remain separate and independent types. This analogy may not be perfect, since neither Gibson’s nor Canova’s pieces are in the pudica pose; however, the pudica pose – which had its beginnings in the Knidia – only came to fruition in the Medici and Capitoline. It is the pudica motif of the Capitoline and Medici, not that of the Knidia, that has been repeated over and over in western art, making them an worthy of study and admiration in their own right.
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CHAPTER THREE
THE QUESTION OF TIME

Both the Medici and the Capitoline have been dated from about 300 to 100. The general tendency in past scholarship was to date the pieces to the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the third century. They were considered reworkings of the Knidia, carried out by followers of Praxiteles. From Felletti-Maj and Havelock, we learn that early scholars such as A. Hauser, W. Amelung and M. Bieber placed a single pudica archetype in the fourth century. Scholars such as Furtwängler followed suit, also placing the pudica archetype in the generation after Praxiteles, which would be around 340. Another two generations would put the piece in the third century, which is where Dickens and Seta in the 1920s placed the pudica prototype. In 1951, Felletti-Maj separated the Capitoline and Medici into two distinct types and pushed the traditional date a little later: she put the Medici at between 300 and 280, and the Capitoline from 200 to 150. Brinkerhoff in 1957 left the Medici in the third century, and like Felletti-Maj placed the
Capitoline in the second century. He places the Capitoline in the second century based on a comparison to the Telephus frieze on the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon. He argues that both pieces “set up and then pierce though the foreground....” He also points to a second-century date, because of the “non-classical shape of the navel.” While there may be some validity to the theory of a chronological progression in the change of the shape of the navel as was seen in chapter two the shape of the navel is not necessarily consistent in every copy. Only when a copy is a very carefully executed pointed copy will the shape of the navel be a reliable method of dating. His argument of dating the piece based on the fringed artists operating under the Roman Empire were extremely creative and took many liberties with what changes they made when “copying” pieces. This was especially true of supports. He also undoes his own argument by pointing out the similarly fringed cloak present with the Cyrene, which he dates to 100. This would support the theory that copyists were very free with what they used for supports, and had a total disregard for any reference to the dating of the original they were copying.
In his 1971 article, Brinkerhoff moves the Medici to the second century, but wants to place the Capitoline back in the fourth century as a work of Scopas. He compares the straight edged hairline on the Medici to a reinterpretation of the Meleager type that is dated to the second century. He also makes no effort to dispute his earlier arguments for a second-century date for the Capitoline and briefly draws a comparison between the Capitoline and the Maenad of Scopas.\textsuperscript{58}

In 1967, Hanfmann placed the Capitoline from 300 to 250 BC, and the Medici from 150 to 100.\textsuperscript{59} He dated the Capitoline based on his perception that she is a “self-conscious awkwardly provocative woman.”\textsuperscript{60} (possibly because of the rounded, hunched shoulders) He dated the Medici based on the “coquettish glance” and the lack of “refinement... [compared to] her late Classical... [predecessor].”\textsuperscript{61} In 1982, Neumer Pfau dates the Capitoline to 300 BC and the Medici to 350,\textsuperscript{62} in part based on how “...retiring and concealing the pose...[is].”\textsuperscript{63} Fuchs dates the Capitoline from 150 to 120 based on the “sensual nakedness”\textsuperscript{64}. Since some of this past scholarship dated the pieces on subjective qualities, I will primarily focus my
arguments on Havelock and Salathé with some mention of
Brinkerhoff’s writings from both 1957 and 1971.

Havelock in 1995 places the original pudica archetype after 100 BC. One of her primary arguments is that the Aphrodite and Pan sculpture from Delos “...is the earliest securely dated and original example of the gesture invented by Praxiteles”\(^6\) (emphasis mine); however, this statement is backed by no concrete evidence. Instead, the piece could easily be a return to the original pose of the Knidia after the Capitoline and Medici were created. The fact that the piece is the only datable piece that mimics the pose of the Knidia does not mean that it is the earliest version, nor does it mean that the Medici and Capitoline must have occurred after it.\(^6\) The Delos piece is more likely to be one of the last reinterpretations of the pudica gesture. Even Brinkerhoff says the piece is “…the final collapse of the harmonious balance between spiritual strength and physical appeal of the Aphrodite tradition.”\(^6\); I do believe, however, that a piece like the Syracuse, which is another reinterpretation, could have occurred as late as the first or second century AD.
If we define, in general terms, what was characteristic of the second and first centuries, we will come to a different conclusion than Havelock. One trend in the second century was for sculpture that loosely copied art from the fifth and fourth century, while the first century is noted more for pieces that combine elements from various sculptures. Pollitt tells us that:

In the early and middle second century B.C. there is a group of sculptors ...[who] devoted their efforts principally to recreating a style like that of Phidias in original works of their own ...[while] in the second half of the second century BC....[artists] specialized in close imitation of specific classical models. 

Brinkerhoff echoes this theory:

Hellenistic sculpture of the second century BC.... continued the traditional Greek concentration upon a limited number of types. [This was] ... a prelude to the advent of copying in the next century.

A few pages later, he reiterates this point:

In my view a predisposition to revive older forms and themes became such an inherent and fundamental element of the art of the second century that one should expect to find that any creation of that time was retrospective in character.

What is fascinating is that Brinkerhoff acknowledges the spirit of this century and even wants to emphasize it:

It is important to emphasize how widespread the tendency was to remember, recreate or adapt famous, popular, and beloved creations of the past.
In spite of this, he still would like to place the Capitoline in the fourth century rather than the second century where he originally placed it. If we follow the thinking of Pollit and Brinkerhoff’s original reasoning, we can conclude that the Delos Pan and Aphrodite is an example of first-century work, while the Medici and Capitoline are examples of second-century work. This can be demonstrated when we see the Pan of the Delos piece is probably taken from a work that is possibly by second-century artist, Heliodoros, and is combined with a reinterpretation of the fourth century Knidia. Art of the first century indiscriminately combines elements from all the previous periods, so that a fourth-century piece and what may be a second-century piece are put together in one. This can also be seen in the S. Ildefonso Group which combines the body of the fifth-century Westmacott athlete and the head of the fifth-century Doryphoros with the fourth-century Apollo Sauroktonos. The piece is typically dated to ca. 50-25. The Delos piece also has the Aphrodite figure’s weight on her proper right leg like the Knidia, although she covers her genitalia with her proper left hand, as do the Capitoline and Medici. So there is a combination of the Knidia’s stance with her successor’s pudica gesture. This is further evidence that the piece is
following — or rather beginning — the first-century convention of combining various elements to create pastiches. The spirit of copying pieces was not a phenomenon of the fourth or third century; it was a characteristic of the second and first century, which is why there were no copies made of the Knidia in the fourth or third century as Havelock seems to expect.  

While I do not want to belabor this point, another second-century recreation is the Aphrodite of Melos. Charbonneaux explains best how the piece has been altered:

This is neither an academician’s tribute to an Old Master nor a mere frigid imitation; the Aphrodite of Capua, derived from a relief, was designed for a profile view, but by taking this sculptural motif and transposing it into a frontal attitude, the creator of the Venus de Milo radically changed the initial concept. The raising of the left foot at once alters the rhythm, and the great undulating movement that runs right down the figure is not to be found in any prototype.  

So we have the reinterpretation exceeding the original which is what occurs, to a lesser extent, with the Knidia, and its reinterpretation as in the Medici and the Capitoline. This also reemphasizes how second-century artists took older types and reinterpreted them in new and exciting ways.
Another point Havelock makes is that there are no Tanagras of the Knidia. The first explanation that comes to mind is that either the coroplasts were not interested in portraying that subject matter, or the subject matter was not in demand by patrons. There is at least one Tanagra that shows a nude, seated Aphrodite with drapery barely covering her pubic area (Fig. 3.01). A piece more representative of Tanagras in general is the Aphrodite with Eros as an infant, as found in the Hermitage (Fig. 3.02). The fact is that the real preoccupation of the creators of the Tanagras was not so much to reproduce famous statue types but to create pretty women, almost exclusively draped, or comic actors. The Venus Genetrix created ca. 410-400 was reproduced as a Myrina and in Smyrna Polyclitian figures were produced. These examples, however, seem to be exceptions rather than the rule and they reproduce sculptural types that are already over 200 years old. Additionally, there is the small piece seen in Uhlenbrock (Fig. 17), which matches the zig-zag drapery and pose of the Tyche of Antioch (circa 300), but which predates the Tyche by almost twenty years. This indicates that small-scale terra cottas do not always follow monumental sculpture. In this case, the smaller
Figure 3.01
Seated Aphrodite from Taras, Fine Arts Museum, San Francisco. Photo from The Coroplast’s Art
(Catalogue #44, page 157)
Figure 3.02
Aphrodite and Eros, Tanagra, late fourth century. Hermitage Museum. Photo from <www.hermitagemuseum.org>
piece reflects general trends that were already in place when the Tyche was created. Therefore, the nude terracotta Aphrodite tells us that nude and semi-nude Aphrodites existed from 350 to 200.

Another general trait that the Medici and Capitoline share is that they both have reversed the contrapposto that was present in the Knidia, so that it is their proper left legs that are the weight-bearing legs. This reversal is present in all the copies of the Capitoline and Medici, except for the Manilii portrait and the small bronze from Sidon (Fig 2.45), as noted before. What the Capitoline and Medici have retained from the Knidia is that both look to their proper left; this means that the Knidia looks to her free leg while the Capitoline and Medici look to their engaged or weight-bearing leg. Robertson notes that “...the head turned toward the firm foot was...a characteristic of fifth century figures.”

If we look at a sampling of fifth- and fourth-century standing pieces, we can see the trend that Robertson was discussing. Fifth-century figures show that about three-fourths (i.e., 73%) of the time, the heads turn to the weight bearing leg while in the fourth century, the number of sculptures that turn their heads to the weight
bearing leg drops to a little more than half (i.e., 59%). This would support Robertson’s theory that the Capitoline and Medici are attempting to be “...more ‘classical’, than the Knidia.”

Salathé in 1997 dates the pudica prototype from the fourth to third century. Her reasoning – that the bow knot is a fourth century style – does not mean that an era caught up in a retrospective style would not have reproduced fourth- or fifth-century hair styles. In fact the bow knot is frequently used as a reference to Aphrodite or other deities on Roman portraits of women. She would place the piece before the second century to allow time for the creation of the numerous variations of the pudica pose to have evolved and spread over the Mediterranean. If we accept the spirit of the second century, rather than the third century, as preoccupied with copying, then it would follow that copying would have only occurred in the second or first century. As noted above, the first half of the second century is when the classical style was reproduced, while the second half of the second century and the first century was a period of copying specific pieces. There is no sound reason for
us to believe it took as long as Salathé would have us believe it took, for variants to evolve or to spread across the Mediterranean. As we saw in chapter two, the Syracuse variant was most likely a direct result of the copying process. While this specific variation could have occurred either any time after the creation of the Capitoline up to the third century AD, the evolution of variants does not necessarily take a century or even half a century to occur. The Amazons of the fifth century show a steady progression of variation, with each occurring about a generation and a half after the other. When Praxiteles created the Olympus Hermes, he directly borrowed and varied the pose from his father’s sculpture. So there is a span of ten to twenty years between the pieces by father and son.

Brinkerhoff dates the Medici to 156, based solely on the passage in Pliny, which claims that works of art after 296-293 (the 121st Olympiad) and before 156-153 (the 156th Olympiad) are inferior to other periods (Pliny, NH 35.49-52). There is no need for us to assume that the period when “art ceased” that Pliny talks about actually produced no works of art worthy of admiration. Pieces such as the portrait of Demosthenes by Polyeuktos
(280–279), the Pergamene Dying Gauls by Epigones (230–
220), the work of Damophon (circa 180–160), the Altar of
Zeus at Pergamon (ca. 180–160 or 172–160) and the
Athenian Lesser Attalid dedication (circa 200–150) are
all pieces that were produced during this period when
"art ceased."

I have argued against the dates proposed by Salathé,
Havelock, and given some general arguments for a second-
century date for both the Capitoline and Medici; the
remainder of this chapter will focus on more specific
reasons why a mid-second century date is the most likely
date for the Medici.

Although I do not want to become involved in the
attribution game, there are some points of comparison
that may be useful. The first is Philiskos of Rhodes. The
name Philiskos is known from Pliny (HN 36.34–35) and at
least one signed base." We know nothing of the artist’s
style, and no sculpture has been definitely attributed to
him. The signed base dates to the end of the second
century or beginning of the first century, and is signed
Philiskos, son of Polycharmos of Rhodes; whether this is
the Philiskos of Rhodes mentioned by Pliny is uncertain.
Kenneth Hamma would attribute the leaning Muse (Fig.
3.03) – copies of which can be found in the Capitoline and the J Paul Getty Museum – and the three Muses in the J Paul Getty Museum (Fig. 3.04) to Philiskos, although there seems to be no material published on the pieces that would support this theory. The leaning Muse and possibly Muse no. 41 are the only two who match the types used on the Archelaos, although the artist may have combined more than one cycle of Muses in the creation of the relief.

A look at these four muses is the first point of comparison. While there are some general similarities, such as the triangular forehead, which the Medici and Capitoline share with the Knidia, none of the faces of the four Muses match the Medici. The Medici has a broadness as seen in the New York copy, the Tomis head and the Munich head, at the cheekbones; none of the Muses possess this characteristic. The eyes of the Muses are larger and the lips, while quite small, do not quite match the shape of the Medici’s lips. A look at the profile of the leaning muse shows several other differences. The leaning Muse has a more rounded forehead with eyes not set as deeply as the Medici’s, and a more prominent chin than that of the Medici.
Figure 3.03
Copy of Leaning Muse, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, CA. Photo from By Judgement of Eye: The Varya and Hans Cohn Collection (Page 105)
Figure 3.04
Muses, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, CA. Photo from Catalogue of the Ancient Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum: The Larger Statuary, Wall Paintings and Mosaics (left to right Figures 39, 40, & 41)
Another second century artist, active earlier than Philiskos, is Damophon. In chapter four, we will look at one coin from the Peloponnesus, which is where Damophon worked. In fact, all the work attributed to him is in the Greek mainland or on the nearby islands. This alone should exclude any association of the artist with the Medici but there are some interesting points of comparison. He also is an artist who specialized in the production of statues of deities and is known to have produced at least three Aphrodites — namely, the Aphrodite Machanitis, an acrolith in Megalopolis; Aphrodite Limenis on the island of Leukas; and for the island of Kythnos, a draped or semi-draped Aphrodite of which only a drapery fragment survives. We can rule out the acrolith as the original of either the Medici or Capitoline, since it would have certainly been a fully clothed figure. Since the coin featuring the Medici is from Megalopolis, this helps us also rule out that city as a possible location for the original type. Themelis suggests that the Aphrodite at Leukas was probably a chryselephantine piece, since there is mention of Damophon’s repair work on the Phidian Zeus in the decree of Leukas. While this does not preclude the piece from
being a nude figure, it is highly unlikely that the original will ever be uncovered and no small scale reproductions have been identified as yet. As far as the Kythnos piece is concerned, we have already seen the drapery, vase and dolphin all used interchangeably as supports, which means there is a possibility the Kythnos piece was either one of the originals or the inspiration for the Medici or Capitoline. Unfortunately, there is not enough remaining of the sculpture to make a judgment one way or the other, and Themelis has suggested the piece resembled a semi-draped Anadyomene although no reason is given. These cult statues primarily indicate that there were several Aphrodite images near the Greek mainland that could have inspired other non-colossal Aphrodite types to be produced, either by local artists or as commissioned by the locals.

To determine whether Damophon was connected to either figure, we can take a less direct route by examining the pieces most often associated with him: the Lykosoura group and some fragmentary heads. The female head identified as Demeter (Fig. 3.05) from the Lykosoura group has shallow “dimples” at the corners of the mouth, while the Artemis head (Fig. 3.06) has deeper
Figure 3.05
Head of Demeter from temple at Lykosoura, National Museum, Athens, Photo from Sculpture & Sculptors of the Greeks (Figure 760)

Figure 3.06
Head of Artemis from the temple at Lykosoura, National Museum, Athens. Photo from Sculpture & Sculptors of the Greeks (Figure 759)
indentations. These carved out areas are similar to the ones on the head of Apollo (Fig. 3.07) from the Messene Museum, and would seem to be a stylistic trait of Damophon. This handling of the corners of the mouth does not match that of the Medici. If we move on to the head of the young hero (Fig. 3.08), also in the Messene Museum, we see his eyes are larger than those of the Medici and there are no similarities in the handling of the corners of the mouth.

The last examples of Damophon’s work to examine are the Tritonesses (3.09), which were on the armrests in the Lykosoura group. There is an original (3.09 bottom left) and a Hadrianic copy (3.09 bottom right), both in the National Museum in Athens. There is a similarity in the broadness of the face at the cheekbones in the original Tritoness; however, like the hero, the eyes are larger than the Medici’s. With no similarities to any of Damaphon’s pieces, we can eliminate any association of the Medici to Damaphon.

We will turn next to a second-century monument that is typically used as the prime example of “Hellenistic baroque,” the Great Altar of Zeus at Pergemon. Our concern is not so much the reference to the “baroque”
Figure 3.07
Head of Apollo from Messene, Messene Museum (plaster cast of original, Center of Messenian Studies, Athens)
Photo from Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture (Fig. 102)

Figure 3.08
Head of a young hero from Messene, Messene Museum.
Photo from Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture (Fig. 97)
Figure 3.09
Tritoness from temple at Lykosoura, National Museum, Athens, Top photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence. Bottom photos from Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture, (Figure 104 (original) on left and Figure 130 (Hadianic copy) on right)
style, but to the fact that unlike most Hellenistic art, it is dateable to the second century. Before looking at the date of the piece, we will look at several figures from the Telephos Frieze. These figures are of particular interest because they are not done in a grandiose style befitting the monument of a king, but in a more pictorial style; as such they are closer to pieces that are often termed “Rococo” because of their playfulness or sensuality, and so in turn are closer in style to the Medici.

There are several figures on the Telephos frieze that have similarities to the Medici. The first point of comparison is the Hercules (Fig. 3.10 and 3.11) which shares with the Medici the broadness of the face, and although the lips are not exactly the same shape they both have a rather subtle drilling at the corners of the mouth. They also share a rather broadness to the bridge of the nose while the entire space between their eyes does not appear to be a full eye width. A look at the profile reveals that the hair line of the Hercules is almost a straight line, as with the Medici. The two are not an exact match, but are close enough that they could be by the same hand. There is also the Meleagar that
Figure 3.10
Head of Herakles from the release of Prometheus group, Great Altar, Staatliche Museum, Pergamonmuseum, Berlin. Photo from Pergamon: The Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar (Figure 8)
Figure 3.11
Head of Herakles from the release of Prometheus group, Great Altar, Staatliche Museum, Pergamonmuseum, Berlin. Photo from Pergamon: The Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar (Figure 8)
Brinkerhoff and Richter mention although an examination of this piece and its relationship to the Medici and Hercules is not possible at this point. A straight hair line could be either a general second century trend or a stylistic trait of a specific artist.

The so-called “beautiful head” (Fig. 3.12), which is thought to come from the main frieze of the Great Altar, shares the broadness of face with the Hercules and the Medici. The face in fact looks like a more matronly, fleshier version of the Medici. The treatment of the hair is significantly different, although the “foamy” quality of the hair could be something the artist devised solely for the representation of Aphrodite.

Next is a fragmentary head from the Telephos frieze (Fig. 3.13). The eyes are elongated like those of the Medici and there is a similarity in the shape of the lips. The hairline, however, is irregular unlike either the Medici or the Hercules.

Lastly, a slab from the frieze has two figures on it that resemble the Medici. The figure on the viewer’s left (Figs. 3.14 & 3.15), which is seen in profile, has lips and features carved more deeply and so the similarities are more noticeable. The first is the elongation – not
Figure 3.12
"Beautiful Head" from Pergamon, probably from the main freize of the Great Altar. Staatliche Museum, Pergamonmuseum, Berlin. Photo from A History of Greek Art (Figure 171C)
Figure 3.13
Fragmentary head from the Telephos Frieze, Staatliche Museum, Pergamonmuseum, Berlin. Photo from Pergamon: The Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar (Catalogue no 13, page 76)
just of the eye itself but the entire eye socket, at least along the upper perimeter that forms the eyebrow. This is emphasized by the fact that there is no indication of the eye socket underneath the eye. Next, although the lips are not exactly the same, there is still a sharp rise to the upper lip and the corner of the mouth has a subtle line. In the case of the young man, the line does not produce a smile. The face of the other young man that faces the viewer (Fig. 3.14) has a similar treatment of face and lips, although he is not an exact duplicate.

The similarities between these last five pieces are similarities not in general Hellenistic trends, but alike in more minute ways that are indicative of a particular artist or a specific school of sculptors. We can then conjecture that all the pieces mentioned were executed by the same hand, or by the same school.

If one can accept the connections I have just discussed relating the Telephos frieze to the Medici we can then use the date of the Telephos date as a starting point to date the Medici. Scholars had generally agreed that the date for the Pergamon Altar was 180 to 160. This has recently been challenged by Andreae, who presents three basic arguments
Figure 3.14
Telephos receives arms from Auge detail of Telephos Frieze, Staatliche Museum, Pergamonmuseum, Berlin. Photo from Pergamon: The Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar
Figure 3.15
Telephos receives arms from Auge detail of Telephos Frieze, Staatliche Museum, Pergamonmuseum, Berlin. Photo courtesy of Prof. Lawrence.
for a date after 166. The first is that clay wine cups with a rather unusual wreath of Asklepios on them can be dated to 172-171. One of these cups was found in the foundation of the altar, which establishes a *terminus post quem*. The second reason is that after the last battle with the Gauls in 168-166, the city of Pergamon would have had money from war booty, with which it could afford to build the altar. The last argument is based on the inscription “*ta agatha,*” (ta agaqa) which indicates blessings from the gods that Andreae attributes to particular events in the last battle.\(^87\) I find all three of Andreae’s arguments convincing, but even if the last two arguments are not accepted, we still have the *terminus post quem* of 172-171 established by the wine cups.

Andreae also believes Pliny, who tells us that Phyromachos designed the altar (*HN* 34.84).\(^88\) Some other works attributed to Phyromachos are a portrait of the philosopher Antisthenes (circa 200-160) and a colossal cult statue of Asklepios at Pergamon.\(^89\)

There is no mention of the artist ever producing an Aphrodite, and a cursory look at the Antisthenes portrait would seem to indicate that he was not directly responsible for the Medici. With a project as large as the altar, we can
say with certainty that there would have been many artists working under Phyromachos. It was one of these artists that was very likely responsible for the Medici. The corner of the mouth are clearly a trait of that particular artist. The Medici could also be a piece executed by a pupil or son of the artist that worked on the Telephos frieze. This means that we cannot place the Medici more than a generation before or after the altar. Using the old dates, this would place the piece from 200 to 140, and using the new dates from 186 to 140. Since I find Andreae’s arguments for the new dates of the altar quite convincing, I would chose the latter dates as the mostly likely for the Medici.

While the above argument might be convincing enough, there is one last point of comparison. A portrait that Smith identifies as Ptolemy VI, Philometor, a second-century king, (Fig. 3.16 and 3.17)\(^9\) shares with the Medici the recessed areas at the corners of the mouth, which is what produces the rather unusual look to the smile. While several other Ptolemaic portraits possess full lips and curled “smile lines” such as the one that Bieber\(^9\) identifies as the third-century queen, Bernice II (Fig. 3.18), none match the mood of the Medici or Ptolemy. Ptolemy VI ruled from 180-145, which is within
Figure 3.16
Ptolemy VI, Alexandria.
Photo from The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age
(Fig. 361 and 363)
Figure 3.17
Ptolemy VI, Alexandria.
Photo from The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age (Fig. 363)
Figure 3.18
Bernice II, Museo Nuovo, Rome.
Photo from The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age
(Fig. 348 and 349)
the range of dates that I proposed for the Medici. Smith
gives no indication that he believes the portrait is a
posthumous portrait. I would not suggest that the
evidence of the Ptolemy portrait alone would be enough to
date the Medici, but it seems to support the date already
proposed. The similarities end with the smile lines –
although this could be because in the portrait’s goal to
bear a resemblance to Ptolemy VI, any other stylistic
traits have been negated. In spite of the fact that it is
only the mood and the smile lines that connect the two
pieces, I would venture to guess that the two pieces, if
not by the same hand, were produced at least by two
artists very closely associated (such as pupil and
teacher). 92

Regardless of who actually executed the piece,
there are good reasons to believe that the Medici was a
product of a second-century trend in neo-classicism or a
retrospective style that was eventually abandoned in favor
of copying the same type over and over in the first century.
Coupled with the general trend of the second century are
more specific similarities of the Medici to the Telephose
freize, which can now be dated from 166 to 160. This in turn
allows us to date the Medici within a generation before or after those dates, or about 186-140.
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CHAPTER FOUR

NUMISMATICS AND THE QUESTION OF PLACE OF ORIGIN

Numismatic evidence is one of the best clues as to where the original of the Medici and the Capitoline types stood because:

Provincial coins generally did not travel far from their city of origin which is generally denoted on the reverse. However, some cities have common obverse which suggest that either the die makers traveled from city to city or cities have common mints.  

Locating a place of origin is then complicated by the fact that there are Aphrodite Pudica coins from Nikopolis ad Istrum in Lower Moesia; Deultum in Thrace (both of which are in present day Bulgaria); three cities in Asia Minor, namely Amasia in Galatia and Saitta and Philadelphia, both in Lydia; and finally Megalopolis in the Peloponnesus. The images of the Knidia, Medici and Capitoline types mostly appear on coins minted under Septimus Severus, and his family which is another matter that deserves examination. But first, a look at the coins that have the Knidia on them is in order. This will give us some basics
with which we can then make conjectures about coins bearing the Medici and Capitoline.

Three coins from Knidos that appear to be from the same die show the Knidia with Asklepios (Fig. 4.01a, 4.01b and 4.02a). In all three, her contrapposto is shown reversed. This could simply be a mistake on the engraver’s part, or a conscious effort in order to balance out the figure that is accompanied by another figure. The reversal does not appear when the Knidia is shown with Apollo (Fig. 4.02b). A relevant comparison can be found in a portrait quotation that uses the pudica pose, from the Tomb of Manilli. The piece is a mirror image of the typical pose, with the weight on her right leg rather than her left. The reversal was done so that the piece would go with the portrait of her husband as Mercury. With the transposition of the pose and when looking at both pieces together, both figures have their weight on their outside legs, with the feet on the relaxed legs pointing toward each other. Brody also mentions instances of the reversal of the sun and moon on the coins of the Aphrodisian Aphrodite, and Brinkerhoff mentions the reversal of the pose on coins with the Aphrodite Anadyomene.

Despite the reversal on the coin, there is no doubt that it is the Knidia that is depicted on the coin. What we see on all the coins
Figure 4.01
Coins from Knidos. Photo from Knidia (Plate 71)
Figure 4.01a GH Hills Numismatic Chronicle (Also see Griechische und Römische Münzen, Sammlung J-P Righetti, Auktion 13, Oktober 2003) Figure 4.01b see Knidia for more information; Figure 4.01c BN, Paris; Figure 4.01d see Knidia for more information
Figure 4.02
Coins from Knidos. Photo from Knidia (Plate 72)
Figure 4.02a and Figure 4.02b see Knidia for more information;
Figure 4.02c - 4.02f Berlin, StM
is the Knidia reduced to her most basic elements, which are the proper right hand covering her pubic area and her proper left hand holding her garment. Aside from the fact that these coins have reduced a major sculpture to an instantly recognized icon, they also demonstrate the ease with which artists, or in this case die makers, in the Roman empire would combine figures. There is no record in Pliny of any other statue accompanying the Knidia, yet she is shown with both Apollo and Asklepius. This will be significant when we examine the Medici and Capitoline. This can be explained by the fact that aside from representing statue types, figures on Imperial coins are primarily meant to signify

Figure 4.03
Coin from Knidos, PC. Photo courtesy of owner.
a city and as such can be actual statues types or simply images of deities that are not based on statue types.

Next, while Havelock contends that the Knidia never achieved fame because it never appeared on coins until the Roman period, the Greek world in which the Knidia was created had only placed the heads of well-known sculpture on their coinage. Havelock even gives a concise history of the coinage from Knidos. To supplement her account, we will take a brief look at some coins from Knidos. This will show what is typical for coins struck by Greek coin makers. There are four archaic examples, two drachmai and two oboli (Fig. 4.04 and 4.05). All four coins have a female head, which we assume to be Aphrodite, on one side, and the lion that represents Apollo, the prominent male deity in Knidos, on the obverse. About a hundred years later, Knidos is still producing a coin with a generic head of Aphrodite and Apollo’s lion, as seen in a silver drachm (Fig. 4.06), which is dated to a few decades before the Knidia. The only difference is that the images have been updated; the basic formula of an Aphrodite head on one side and the fore part of a lion on the other has not changed. Havelock tells us that around the time the Knidia was created, the prow of a ship was added to the same side as the head to indicate that it was Aphrodite
Figure 4.04 Archaic drachm from Knidos.
Photo from <www.christies.com>

Figure 4.05 Archaic obol from Knidos
Photo from <www.ancientimports.com>
Figure 4.06
Silver drachm from Knidos ca. 394-387 BC. Photo from <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/9854/PageAph.html>. A similar coin can be found at <coinaraches.com> (Fritz Rudolf Künker Münzenhandlung, Auction 77, September 30, 2002, Lot 184)

Figure 4.07
Silver diobol from Knidos, ca 390-330 BC, PC.
Photo courtsey of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.
Euploia that was shown. Although not shown with the prow of a ship, there is one lone example (Fig. 4.07) of a diobel with a head that resembles a head of a figure by Praxiteles. The head is not identical to the Knidia but it does resemble a Praxitelian head more than any other coin from Knidos. There is only one band or ribbon in the hair, a wisp of hair in front of the ear and an ill defined bun on the back of the head. Even if it is the head of the Knidia it is not the entire statue that will occur on later coins.

Havelock continues her history of Knidian coins by telling us that around 190, the head of Aphrodite is dropped in favor of Apollo (or Helios). What she fails to tell us is that this coincides with the time that Rome gave Caria and Lycia to Rhodes. In 129 Knidos, with the rest of Caria, was incorporated into the Roman empire with the final defeat of the Seleucid Empire. So what appears to have happened is that when Knidos was under control of Rhodes, Helios was used on coins and it is only after Rome took over at the end of the second century that coins had the Knidia statue type on them. Havelock even says “Not until the Roman period do coins furnish...a secure image of the Knidia.”  
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Figure 4.08 Bronze coin (4 assaria piece) from Nicoplis ad Istrum, PC. Diadumenian on obverse and Aphrodite Pudica on reverse. Top detail of reverse. Photo courtesy of P. G. Burbules.
Figure 4.09
Bronze coin (4 assaria piece) from Nicoplis ad Istrum. Aphrodite Pudica on reverse, Diadumenian on obverse (not shown), PC. Photo courtesy of Doug Smith
Next we turn to the coins that feature the Medici and the Capitoline. For the Medici most examples come from Nikopolis ad Istrum, which was a city founded around AD 110 by Trajan. The first two examples feature Diadumenian the Caesar under Macrinus (ca. AD 217) on the obverse. Both coins appear to be struck from the same die (Fig. 4.08 and 4.09), and have on the reverse a figure that looks like the Medici - not just because of the Dolphin, but because of the bun, the turn of the head and the shape of the shoulders. The Knidia does not turn her head entirely to the side, but that is how she is portrayed on Roman coins; it follows, then, that the Medici whose head turns slightly as evidenced by the New York copy would also be represented this way. The one confusing item is the drapery. As already seen with the Capitoline-Syracuse variant and even the Knidia variants (notably the Venus Felix), drapery is a common addition to many of the Aphrodite-Venus types. So the image represented on the coins could represent a variant similar to (but not identical to) the Torlonia variant. The only other possibility is that the figure shown is an aberration which would be a figure that has strayed or wandered from the original type. This might have resulted because of misunderstandings on the part of the die maker.
This figure also has the addition of what appear to be thick anklets or less likely, boots. The armlet on the bronze quotation of the Capitoline (Fig. 2.29) demonstrates that ancient sculpture did include such jewelry although the one on the Colonna copy of the Knidia is the addition of a restorer. The Ares Borghese has an ankle ring although there is as yet no evidence of an Aphrodite with an ankle ring other than this particular coin.

The next three examples from Nikopolis ad Istrum are very different (Fig. 4.10). The first two, which have Julia Domna on the obverse, show a figure whose arms do not jut out as much as the other examples (Fig. 4.08 and 4.09), who has more rounded shoulders and a frontal face with an obvious bowknot hair style. The added cupid is most likely a reference to Julia Domna’s son, Caracalla. Although cupids or erotes often appear as supports with both the Capitoline and Medici types, in looking at the coin of Plautilla which features no cupid (not shown) we can conjecture that in this instance, the cupid, as the son of Aphrodite, is in part a reference to children. The specific reference is to Julia Domna’s two children, Caracalla and Geta and a general reference to the continuation of the dynasty. There is at least one sculpture in the pudica pose with
Figure 4.10
Bronze coins from Nicoloplis ad Istrum. Photos courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence. Top to Bottom: Julia Domna on obverse with Capitoline Venus, on reverse; Julia Domna on obverse with Capitoline Venus on reverse; Septimus Severus on obverse and Capitoline Venus on reverse.
a portrait head, which had a cupid that probably does not serve as a support.\(^{100}\)

The fact that there are coins from the same city with two different types seems to support the evidence that there are two separate types, although as was noted in chapter two the Capitoline could be a variant of the Medici. This might mean that the city possessed a copy of each type which could have been brought from elsewhere or copies could have been commissioned specifically for the city. If copies were commissioned for this city, however, we are still left with the question: for what city were the originals of the Medici or Capitoline created? In addition, the images on the coins might represent certain ideas rather than specific statue types found in the city. Exactly what concepts the different pudica figures represented is not known. The two types might also reflect different die makers and their particular familiarity with or their preference for different statue types.

The Septimius Severus example (Fig. 4.10) is slightly different from the others, in that it features the more typical loutrophoros with drapery. Smith notes that female statue types appear on male portrait coins only when the virtue or idea represented is appropriate to both males and females. If we are
to believe Salathé the virtue represented might be modesty.\textsuperscript{101} The other occasion that female statue types, personification, or goddesses appear on the male issues is in the early reign of Septimius, in the eastern provinces, because of a failed “...understanding of the proper use of types.”\textsuperscript{102} This coin is from early in the reign of Septimius and as such may reflect such a misunderstanding.

Next we turn to Deultum in Thrace on the coast of the Black Sea, which was a colony founded by Vespasian.\textsuperscript{100} There are two types of coins from this colony, the first features a generic pudica figure that appears to be frontal with a barely visible vase (Fig. 4.11). Another coin features a small pudica figure inside a temple again with a vase. (Fig 4.12 & 4.13) There is no evidence that either the Capitoline or Medici was a cult statue. In fact, the Knidia was housed in a shrine outside the temple meaning it was not a cult figure either. Any temples built for the colony might have created cult images based on already existing sculptural types such as the Medici or Capitoline. The figure is too small to determine if it is meant to be Medici or Capitoline.

The next city to examine is Saitta in Lydia, of which nothing is known. The only record of its existence is its coins,
Figure 4.11
Bronze coin from Deultum, Thrace. Tranquillina on obverse, Venus Pudica with vase on reverse. Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.

Figure 4.12

Figure 4.13
Bronze coin from Deultum in Thrace. Gordianus III on obverse, temple with Venus Pudica on reverse, PC. Photo courtesy of owner.
so little conjecture can be made about the city.\textsuperscript{103} However, examining the coins may tell us something about the Medici or Capitoline types. First there are examples that feature a pudica figure in what might be either a shorthand image of a temple or more likely a shrine like the one that housed the Knidia. Salathé says the only cities to produce these coins are Saitta and Philadelphia, a city some 80 miles east of Smyrna.\textsuperscript{104} She also says that coins from other areas do not depict the figure in a temple, but she must simply be unaware of the examples from Deultum. There is also not just one die with these figures. There are examples that show both the typical triangular pediment of a Greek temple and a dome or semicircular roof or an arched doorway (Fig. 4.14). The example from Philadelphia in The British Museum shows a figure with a tiny dolphin at its side.\textsuperscript{105} These cities in Lydia might have had a particular cult of Aphrodite that created a cult image based on the Capitoline or Medici or one of the temples received or commissioned a shrine with a separate life size statue much like the Knidia was probably housed outside a temple. Philadelphia had been founded by Attalos II of Pergamon who ruled from 159-138 and since those dates fall within the dates I proposed for creation of the Medici (186-140) it is possible that a new sculpture may have
Figure 4.14

Figure 4.15
Bronze coin from Saitta in Lydia with Crispina on obverse and Venus pudica on reverse. Photo from Münzen und Medaillen AB Basel (Auktion 41 12/19 Juni 1970, no 430 pl 25)
been created for the new city. While this is certainly an attractive theory it is not provable.

The next example from Saitta features Crispina on the obverse and a figure that is definitely in the pudica pose (Fig. 4.15). This figure has a bun and an accompanying dolphin and Eros, although the arms are held closely to the body rather than jutting out, as on the examples of the Medici from Nikopolis. There are also what appear to be extra tendrils of hair that fall to the shoulders. If they are indeed locks of hair, then the figure could represent a piece like the Tauride Venus in the Hermitage. There is also the fact that the head is in profile rather than frontally like the Nikopolis coins, and there is something on the head that could either be a very small bowknot (like the Medici) or a headpiece, such as a stephane. All this leads me to believe that the piece represented is more Medici than Capitoline. These coins also have the figure, Eros and dolphin reversed. We have already seen this with the Knidia, Aphrodisian Aphrodite and the Anadymone Aphrodite. The Eros and dolphin are more apparent on another example (Fig. 4.17), which has Clodius Albinus on the obverse. The figures on these two coins are very similar but are not from the same die.
Figure 4.17
Coins from Saitta, Lydia. Photo from Munzauktion, Tkalec and Rauche April 1985 (Catalogue no 250)
Figure 4.18
Bronze coin from Pontos Amasia in Galatia (later Pontus) with Lucius Verus on obverse and Venus pudica on reverse. Photo courtesy of Prof. Patricia Lawrence.

Figure 4.19
Bronze coin from Pontos Amasia in Galatia (later Pontus) with Lucius Verus on obverse and Venus pudica on reverse. Photo from Münzen und Medaillen AB Basel (Auktion 41 12/19 Juni 1970, no 327 pl 17)
Next is a coin with Lucius Verus on the obverse and Aphrodite and Ares on the reverse, which comes from Amasia in Galatia (Fig. 4.18 and Fig. 4.19). As we saw with the Knidia, pairing figures with other statue types or other figures was common with Imperial die-makers and even sculptors who catered to Roman patrons, as evidenced by the combination portraits of the Emperor and Empress as Venus and Mars. This is a reference to the Emperor and Empress being the mother and father of the Roman people, just as Venus and Mars were the divine ancestors of the Roman people. It is additionally a reference to the passionate love between the Emperor and Empress. Aphrodite also has a warlike aspect, especially in Asia Minor which may be her function on this coin. The head of this figure is too worn away to tell much, but it does appear that the head is frontal rather than a profile, which probably indicates the piece referred to is the Capitoline. However, the first example (Fig 4.18) shows a figure with a face that appears to be in profile.

The area surrounding Amasia had been occupied since Neolithic times, but a history of the city of Amasia itself has not been written. Amasia was originally a city in Pontus, which became a kingdom in 337. The region eventually was incorporated into Galetia after Rome conquered Pontus in 81. There is scant
evidence that during the Hellenistic and Roman periods some Hellenization of the area occurred, but the extent of this is not well known.108

This discussion of Amasia brings us to the story that Pliny tells us about Nicomades wanting to buy the Aphrodite from Knidus (HN 36:21). Since none of the Kings of Bithynia with the name Nicomades was known as a connoisseur of the arts, there is some difficulty in determining which one was willing to pay such a hefty price for the Knidian Aphrodite. We might even want to conjecture that when Knidos turned down the King of Bithynia, he had his own nude Aphrodite commissioned – a nude Aphrodite like the Medici or Capitoline. A separate type may have been preferred to an exact copy after the rejection. A freehand copy, rather than a pointed copy, would have been the only thing possible because of the tinting of the Knidia. So, a new version of Aphrodite may have been in the eyes of the artist and the King: an Aphrodite that surpassed the Knidia. If this theory is correct, the Nicomades Pliny mentions would be Nicomades II Epiphanes (149–91), at least for the dates I have proposed for the Medici. While this is plausible, it is not provable.

This Nicomades is also known to have joined forces in 108 and 107 with Mithridates Eupator (VI), King of Pontus, to
conquer Paphlagonia, the area that lay between their two kingdoms. Any type of alliance might have resulted in coinage or a sculpture to commemorate the event. Coinage might have used the Medici on the coin, although the date is too late for the sculpture itself. However no alliance coins featuring the Medici from either Bithynia or Paphlagonia, have been discovered. In spite of this either area could have been the realm for which the original of the Medici or Capitoline was created. Again we have a scenario that is not provable.

The last coin and city to consider is Megalopolis, which was founded in 369 to put an end to Spartan supremacy in the Peloponnesus. The city was destroyed in 223 by Sparta, but was rebuilt and enjoyed some prosperity. As was discussed in chapter three, Damophon made an acrolitic Aphrodite for Megalopolis which was almost certainly a clothed figure. So the presence of this coin may mean that there was a copy of the Medici or Capitoline in Megalopolis or that whatever the pudica Aphrodite represented was what the city felt appropriate at one particular point in time. The figure on this coin (Fig. 4.20) is reversed, like the coins from Knidos and Saittia. This coin has the dolphin and the arms jutting out, although the head is frontal.
Figure 4.20
Coin from Megalopolis in the Peloponnesus. Photo from LICM (Fig. 421) Coin also appears in Ancient coins illustrating lost masterpieces of Greek art; a numismatic commentary on Pausanias, Plate V, Figure VIII.
rather than profile. Since a bowknot is not obvious, I suspect that it is the Medici that is represented.

There is one last piece of evidence to consider, and rather than being a coin it is a statue: the Aphrodite from the Troad by the artist Menophantos. R. Smith says that it “[w]ould be considered a Capitoline-Medici variant were it not for an inscription....” He also implies that the quality of the piece is substandard. Felletti-Maj concurs with R. Smith on this point, at least for the other four known copies of the piece. She says that the exception to this statement is the original name piece with the inscription in the Museo Nazionale in Rome.

Felletti-Maj continues by pointing out that the Troad matches the Capitoline in size, but asserts that rather than being a copy of the Capitoline, both originate from one prototype. The one major area that the Troad differs from the Capitoline in that the shoulders are wider. As was noted in chapter two the Medici has wider shoulders. Because there is much restoration to the Troad name piece and the original head is on another copy in Ince Blundel Hall in England, I am unwilling to discuss it in detail; however, the one important thing that the piece can tell us is that nude Aphrodites were popular all throughout the Hellenized areas of Asia Minor. As we
saw with the Syracuse, a variant often becomes so powerful an image that it becomes a type or subtype by itself. This did not happen with the Troad, if the small number of copies is any proof. Some scholars place too much emphasis on the fact that there is a name attached to this particular piece, which is in fact nothing more than a variant of the Medici, based on the shoulders. However the piece could also be or a variant of the Capitoline based on the overall height. Either way the piece was produced by an artist that may have taken some pride in his unusual use of the drapery as support, and which was a direct reference to the Knidia.

With coins from three cities in Asia Minor, the most likely place of origin seems to be Asia Minor. The kingdoms that border the Black Sea appear to be even more probable when we consider the coins from Nikopolis ad Istrum and Deultum in Thrace, the freehand Medici head found in Tomis seen in chapter two (Fig 2.34), and consider the relative proximity and interaction and trade that would have occurred between the areas. There is also the story from Pliny of King Nicomedes and the Aphrodite from the Troad, which indicates the popularity of Aphrodite in the area. The coastal areas of Asia Minor, seeing the fame of the Aphrodite of Knidos, desired their own nude
Aphrodite, whether as a cult image or not. This general desire may have fueled Pliny’s account of Nicomedes. Another possibility is Lydia where coins from two cities show a pudica image in a temple or shrine. One of these cities, Philadelphia, was even founded around the dates that I proposed for the Medici. In addition Philadelphia was founded by one of the rulers of Pergamon, where another ruler had commissioned the creation of the Great Altar of Zeus which was the very monument I associated with the Medici in chapter three. So despite the various unprovable theories on which one of these cities was the most likely place where the original of the Medici stood it is almost a certainty that Asia Minor, which was an area most receptive to the idea of a nude Aphrodite, is where the original Medici stood.
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CHAPTER FIVE

THE AFTERMATH

Summary

The Medici and Capitoline are the result of an evolutionary process that began in the archaic age. Although the Knidia can be attributed to a well known fourth-century artist, the Medici and Capitoline as the final steps in the evolution are equally important. Without the Knidia, the Medici and Capitoline might never have existed, but without the Capitoline and Medici, the Knidia would have been simply the beginning of female nudity as an acceptable subject for art. That in and of itself is a major contribution but the motif of the Knidia has not been repeated as often as the pudica pose of the Capitoline and Medici. The Knidia was a long time in coming, but it was the eventual next step after the exploration of the nude male which had reached its zenith in the fifth century. In addition to the Knidia being the first monumental nude of an Olympian deity, she was the final unveiling of the female nude that had begun with wet drapery in the earlier classical phase. As noted in chapter one, Rome’s interest in Greek art began in the second century, as they carried away spoils of war. Greek
artists of the second century responded to the Roman love of Greek art by creating works that were meant to be in the style of the past. It was this climate in which the Aphrodite of Melos, the Capitoline and the Medici were created. In the first century, the copying industry that simply reproduced the same images over and over came into being, and produced the very copies through which scholars today in large part study both Greek and Roman sculpture. It was also because of this industry that so many variations of a particular type were created—rather than exact duplicates—creating what Marvin calls a replica series. A replica series includes any minor changes, such as the treatment of hair or changes in the support. Changing the support resulted in the creation of variants like the Syracuse and Troad. Also in the replica series are the variants such as the Venus Felix and quotations like the portraits in the guise of the Medici or Capitoline. All these changes were either a response to a patron’s demands or one of the few means of artistic creativity within the limitations of the copying industry.

Although never fully explored in depth it is highly probably that the Medici and Capitoline originated from
one original prototype, rather than two separate types as Havelock, Salathé and Felletti-Maj all suggest.\textsuperscript{110} My theory is that the Capitoline is a variant of the Medici. This can be explained by the academic style of the Capitoline and the fact that it is more appealing physically to a Roman audience.\textsuperscript{111} If we take this into consideration, we can hypothesize on the evolution of the various types discussed. It all began with an Aphrodite of the Medici type created around 186 to 140 (or 130). At least two pointed copies were made (i.e., the Florence and New York copies) from this piece (which might mean the original was of bronze) at some undetermined point in time. Other freehand or pointed copies that were created some distance from the original were also produced. A less sensuous and more matronly Aphrodite, the Capitoline, was produced in marble. There were pointed copies made of this piece as well, which resulted in the creation of the Syracuse variant. A rather clever artist attempted to recreate the mood of the original bronze Medici by eliminating the usual supports; instead, he used drapery as the support. This artist may have been particularly creative and intelligent, but lacked the skills and finesse to produce a piece equal to either the
Medici or Capitoline. This variant was only copied a few times, probably because of the lack of interest shown by patrons.

If we continue with this theory on the evolution of the pudica pose, we might believe that the Medici is the Greek Aphrodite while the Capitoline is the Roman Venus. The Capitoline hunches forward to help hide her breasts, while the Medici has no such reservations. If we are to deal with the “shame” of the statue, we could say that the Medici possesses no shame and thus is still an Aphrodite concealing herself in a seductive way. The Capitoline on the other hand was better suited to become an icon for the Roman virtue of modesty. The statue shows a woman attempting to cover her body out of self-respecting modesty. A Roman audience might have attached concepts of marital fidelity, the production of legitimate offspring and modesty to a goddess that was originally for them, a numen of gardens, not of sexuality. The original intention of the artist who created the Medici was to present a female who simultaneously is concealing the very part of her anatomy that men desire most, in a seductive manner. Artists creating for a Roman market co-opted the pudica gesture
to create a Roman work that was used to indicate a woman who was both attractive and modest. This is also the best argument for why there is no pubic hair or any indication of labia on the pieces.\textsuperscript{113}

The fact that the Medici is a product of the early phase of retrospective styles places it in the second century. The date for the Medici can be narrowed down to 186–140, based on similarities to a number of figures on the Telephos frieze. The dating for the frieze has recently been brought down from 180–160 to 166–160, based on clay wine cups dated to 172–171 that were found in the base of the Great Altar. There are also long petal bowls and stamped amphora handles, also found under the base of the altar, which date to the 150s; this could push the date of the Medici as late as 130, since I would not want to place the Medici any more than a generation after the Great Altar.\textsuperscript{114}

The original of the Medici almost certainly was created for one of the coastal areas of Asia Minor. This can be deduced not only from numismatic evidence, but also by the Aphrodite from the Troad and Pliny’s account of Nicomedes and my own association of the Medici with the Altar of Pergamon. Nude Aphrodites would have been
most popular in Asia Minor where female nudity was more accepted, especially for Aphrodite. It was from the Near East that Greece originally took the idea of nude female figures. The Medici, Capitoline and Troad were all reinterpretations of the Knidia, a sculpture some two hundred years old, which itself was a reinterpretation of a motif at least five hundred years old that had originated in the Near East.

The Aftermath

The “Hellenistic variants” of the Knidia, as Boardman calls the Medici and Capitoline, were the springboard from which western art took its cue. Velders also refers to them as variants, but unlike Boardman acknowledges the real relationship between the types when he says: “The Cnidian [sic] Venus may be the start of the parade, however, two Hellenistic variations established the archetype...”115 This pudica pose became the standard gesture of Venus, and was first imitated by Roman artists not only in the copies of the Medici and Capitoline, but also in the portraits of free women with a moderate amount of wealth. This was an indication of both the attractiveness and the modesty of the women portrayed. Three such examples can be seen in Beiber’s Ancient
Copies. The first she calls a Medici which does have a similarity in the shape of the shoulders (Fig. 5.02). She then compares a Hadrianic example from Veii to the Troad, although this piece really looks more like a variant of the Capitoline (Fig. 5.03). Lastly, she calls one a Capitoline and the piece does match the Capitoline in the roundness of the shoulders (Fig. 5.01). So while there are some very basic similarities to either the Medici or Capitoline, the pieces are quotations of the pudica motif and only meant to be recognizable as a generic pudica Venus.

The pose also appeared in mosaics and texts illustrating the calendar year, with some small figure in the background to indicate Venus in the month of April which is when the Veneralia, the festival of Venus Verticordia, fell (Fig. 5.04 and 5.05). Both the pudica pose and the anadyomene pose are used for this purpose. These tiny pictographs are the same type of image as those used on Roman coins. The use of the pudica pose continued well after the Roman Empire fell.

Since Italian artists never lost touch with the classical past, it was there that the pudica pose was preserved. In the fourteenth century, Giovanni Pisano
Figure 5.01
Portrait statue as Capitoline, Museo Nazionale, Naples.
Taken from Ancient Copies (Plate 42 Fig. 242)

Figure 5.02
Portrait statue as Medici, Museo Nazionale Naples.
Taken from Ancient Copies (Plate 42 Fig. 241)

Figure 5.03
Portrait statue as Capitoline, Vatican.
Taken from Ancient Copies (Plate 42 Fig 239)
5.04
April, Vindobonensis ms (MS 3416 fol 5v)
Osterreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna
Attis in an addaption of the "pudica" gesture Taken from On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 (Fig. 34)

5.05
April, (detail) Ostia mosaic fourth century Archeological Park, Ostia Italy.
Taken from On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 (Fig 76)
Figure 5.06
Fortitude and Prudence from the pulpit in Pisa Cathedral (1310) by Giovanni Pisano.
Taken from *The Nude: A Study in Ideal Form* (Fig. 74)
most likely copied the Capitoline Aphrodite (based on the shape of the head and the proportions) when creating his image of prudence (wisdom) for the pulpit of Pisa Cathedral (1310 AD) (Fig. 5.06). His father, Nicola Pisano (circa 1220-1284 AD) had transformed a nude Hercules into fortitude for the pulpit of the Pisa Baptistery. The attempt to redefine Venus is not completely effective, as other artists would use other means to represent the cardinal virtue of prudence, until Joel Peter-Whitkin in the twentieth century combined the pudica pose with the snake that prudence is often seen standing on in other representations (Fig. 5.07).\textsuperscript{116}

Kenneth Clark says:

\begin{quotation}
\begin{quote}
Pisano’s figure is a complete anachronism. We must wait for over a hundred years before nakedness is no longer the accidental endowment of our first parents, but can claim, once more, to be represented among the worshipful symbols of human impulse.\textsuperscript{117}
\end{quote}
\end{quotation}

The “hundred years later” that Clark talks about occurs in the fifteenth century, when Botticelli created the \textit{Birth of Venus} (ca. 1485 AD). This painting restored the pose to the goddess for whom it was originally created, and restored its simultaneous functions as a pose of modesty and seductiveness. Earlier in the fifteenth century Masaccio (\textit{Expulsion from the Garden of
Figure 5.07
Prudence by Joel Peter-Whitkin.
Taken from <http://www.fotomundo.com/miscela/reportajes/witkin.shtml>
Eden, AD 1426) and Jan van Eyck (Ghent Altarpiece, AD 1432) had used the pudica pose as a sign of shame. Scholars have been debating what degree of shame the Knidia, Capitoline and Medici have “felt” for more than a century, but there is not any concrete evidence that the artist wanted to portray shame as these more recent artists did.\textsuperscript{118} After Botticelli, the pose again became the standard attribute of Aphrodite, and so it continues to be used up to the present day.

In a sixteenth-century calendar, we see the return of the Roman device of using a tiny Venus recognized solely by her pudica pose (Fig. 5.08). This century also saw many artists use the pudica pose to represent modesty or an attribute of Venus. Titian used the pose several times, with the most obvious reference seen in Venus with a Mirror (ca. AD 1555) (Fig. 5.09). There is also the Venus of Urbino (Fig. 5.09), which is a direct reference to the Sleeping Venus, a painting begun by Giorgione and finished by Titian himself.\textsuperscript{119} Additionally, he uses the pose twice for Mary Magdalene, first around 1530 AD for the saint shown in the nude (Fig. 5.09), and then again some thirty years later for his Penitent St. Mary Magdalene (1565 AD). This second painting shows Mary
Figure 5.08
April, Flemish Book of Hours, early 16th century
The British Library London (Add MS 24098 fol 21b)
Taken from The Medieval Calendar Year (Fig 6-16)
Figure 5.09
Paintings by Titian featuring the pudica pose.
Top: Venus of Urbano by Titian (c. 1538) Uffizi, Florence
Taken from <http://employees.oneonta.edu/farberas/arth/arth213/Titian_Venus-urbino.html>
Left: Venus with a mirror by Titian (c. 1555)
National Gallery of Art, Washington DC. Taken from <http://www.artprints-on-demand.co.uk>
Figure 5.10
Venus by Raphael (before 1508?). Photo from The Nude: A Study in Ideal Form (Fig. 86)
Magdalene with clothing, but still in the pudica pose; both pieces are using the pose to indicate a combination of shame and modesty. Lastly, Titian uses the pose in *Spain succoring Religion* (1575 AD).

Also in the sixteenth century is Raphael’s portrait of a nude woman called the *Fornarina* (circa 1518 AD). About a decade earlier, Raphael had produced a sketch that seems to be a direct reference to the Medici (Fig. 5.10), although she turns her head to her proper right, as in Pisano’s piece.

Jan Gossaert (called Mabuse) in the late fifteenth century or early sixteenth century (ca 1478 - 1533) created a variant of the pudica pose in his Venus looking into a mirror. Once again the head turns to the right, in this case to look into a mirror held in her proper right hand. Lorenzo di Credi (ca. AD 1459-1537) who was a contemporary of Gossaert reversed the position of the arms of his Venus, so the proper right hand covers only one breast and the proper left hand rather than being in front of the genitals rests at her side while clutching the drapery that does cover the genitals.

In the seventeenth century, Peter Paul Rubens painted *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars (Peace and War)* in
AD 1629-30; in it, Pax squeezes milk from her left breast and has her right hand in the area of her genitals, which are already covered with drapery. This particular painting underlines the intent of the artist who originally created the Medici, which is to create an image that both conceals and emphasizes female anatomy. The difference is that Rubens is using the female figure as an allegory to make an intellectual point that is lacking in the Medici: it is a piece that simply delights in the physicality of a woman’s body. Ruben may also have intended to please a voyeuristic interest of his patron, but the allegory is the justification to do this while the Medici has no such pretense.

Aside from the “neo-classical” movement of the second and first centuries BC, interest in classical art has peaked regularly. One of the best-known “neo-classical” periods occurred at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century. However, even before this particular revival, at the end of the seventeenth century or beginning of the eighteenth century, at least five copies of the Medici were made for Louis XIV, who reigned AD 1643-1715. In the eighteenth century, there were numerous small-scale quotations of
Figure 5.11
Oil lamp with the goddesses Athena, Diana and Aphrodite adorsed, late 19th century
Photo from <www.christies.com>
the Medici produced in lead to be used as garden sculpture. In addition to actual copies, original creations such as the nineteenth century lamp that features Athena, Artemis and Aphrodite made use of Aphrodite’s standard pose (Fig. 5.11).

The interest in classical art continued as the neo-classical and romantic period gave way to academic art of the nineteenth century. The effects of all three of these “movements” can be seen in the work of John Gibson. Gibson exhibited his Tinted Venus (Fig. 5.12) at the International Exhibition of 1862, about five years after its creation. There is also a small-scale (31 inches) replica of the Medici executed by an unknown artist working in the nineteenth century (Fig. 5.13). Yet another unknown artist in the nineteenth or early twentieth century produced the Venus head at Shadows-on-the-Teche in New Iberia, Louisiana (Fig. 5.14) A completely modern copy or cast from as early as the eighteenth century is found in the lobby of an exclusive hotel in Rome. The piece can currently be seen in both print and Internet advertisements for the hotel (Fig. 5.15).
Figure 5.12
*Tinted Venus* by John Gibson, 1851-56
Polychromed marble, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.
Taken from <http://www.scholars.nus.edu/landow/victorian/sculpture/misc/gibson1.html>

Figure 5.13
Nineteenth Century reproduction of the Medici Aphrodite
taken from <www.edgarlowen.com>
Figure 5.14
Garden sculpture at Shadows-on-the-Teche, New Iberia, LA. Late Nineteenth or Early Twentieth century reproduction of a Venus type head. Photographs by author.

Figure 5.15
Ad for Hotel dei Borgognoni (left) and entrance to the Hotel (right). Ad from <http://courses.educ.ksu.edu/EDETC886/GraphicDesign/modules/mod7/venus_hotelborg.html> entrance from <http://www.channels.nl/80332b.html>
Figure 5.16
Venus Victorious by Renoir, 1914, bronze. New Orleans Museum of Art. Photo from a brochure for The Sydney and Walda Besthoff Sculpture Garden
Although the pudica pose had more of an effect on art than the Knidia, there are occasional references to the Knidia. Renoir made two such pieces: first, there is *La Baigneuse au Griffon* (AD 1870) which is simply a mirror image of the Knidia with a woman discarding her late nineteenth-century clothing. In the early twentieth century, he created the sculpture *Venus Victorious* (AD 1914) (Fig. 5.16). The piece, although a completely separate and original sculptural type, makes reference to the Knidian Aphrodite; unlike either the Knidia or Medici, however, there is no attempt to shield any of “...what is necessary to cover for moral watchdogs.”123 In the mid-twentieth century the artist Yves Klein simply made a cast of the Knidia and covered it with blue pigment to create *La Venus d’Alexandrie* (*Vénus Bleue*) (Fig. 5.17).

We return to the pudica pose and see that the Medici has also made appearances in at least two films in the twentieth century. The first was *Clash of the Titans* (1981), which took extensive liberties with the Perseus myth. The hero, Perseus, finds his gifts from the gods in front of their statues, including a sword in front of the Medici Aphrodite. The second appearance was at the seedy
Figure 5.17
Figure 5.18
hotel in the opening scenes of Married to the Mob (1988). Here the association is simultaneously a pretense to culture and the association of Aphrodite with sex.

Even the twenty-first century has seen the appearance of celebrated images of Aphrodite. First is the Tauride Venus on a commemorative three-ruble piece issued in 2002 to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Hermitage (Fig. 5.18). The piece shows the figure’s face in profile—just as ancient Roman coins did, in spite of the fact that the figure does not turn her head enough to have the head in profile. Next, the pudica pose has appeared at least twice: first in an episode of the television series, Buffy the Vampire Slayer (“Grave” 2002), a statue of the fictitious demoness, Proserpexa, is represented in gold with her tongue out, Kali-like, and her hands in the pudica pose; she has a snake rather than drapery to help conceal her private parts. The next appearance was for comic effect in the trailer for the movie Looney Tunes: Back in Action (2003), in which Daffy Duck assumes the pudica pose when all his feathers are blown off in an explosion. That the pose can be used in popular culture in such a way demonstrates how easily recognized it is, even in the twenty-first century. While everyone may not know
that it is derived from the Medici and Capitoline, it is recognized as a symbol of female modesty or of female divinity and also recognized as a reference to Botticelli’s Venus. In spite of this, it is the Aphrodite of Melos that is more well known to the modern world. This can even be seen in the world of garden sculpture today. The nude Venus types that are readily available are the Venus of Melos, Canova’s Venus Italica, and a three-dimensional version of Botticelli’s Venus. An almost life-size (5’4" to 5’6", including base) concrete version of any of these figures can be purchased for $US250 to $US400. For those more familiar with art, a 12" to 25" Capitoline or Medici Venus can be found for $US75 to $US500.124

What this trip through the ages has demonstrated is that the pudica pose, as preserved through Botticelli’s Venus, has endured much longer than the fame of the Knidia. Velders sums this point up best:

This pose, known as the ‘Venus Pudica’ (Modest Venus) combines the three qualities (aesthetic, ethical and erotic) in such a harmonious way that it was used for over 2000 years by artists, authors and philosophers for many purposes, but most of all as a trademark of beauty. 125

Although these purposes may change with society the pose remains a part of the psyche of the modern world. For
this reason alone, the Medici and Capitoline are worthy of our admiration and continued study.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE


111 D’Ambra, CV, 225-227. Ancient sources describe physical attributes men looked for in a suitable wife (i.e., one capable of bearing healthy children, particularly sons). One of these traits is a “masculine-looking” woman, because she will “bear sons.” How masculine-looking the Capitoline looks is purely subjective, although from the rear the low-slung buttocks on the prominent hips of the Capitoline have a more masculine look than those of the Medici. My theory of the Capitoline as a variant of the Medici and that the Capitoline was a creation for a Roman market rather than a Greek one are not argued in this thesis and would be best dealt with in a separate study.


113 Ridgway, “Some Personal Thoughts on the Knidia,” paragraph 10, endnote 13, suggests that the Roman copyists may have left out details of female genitalia to please Roman patrons. Also a full discussion of the Capitoline as a Roman creation would be most effectively dealt with in a separate paper. One which would explore, among other things, the find spots of the numerous copies of the Capitoline Aphrodite which Havelock asserts were found in Rome and the Western provinces as opposed to the generic small replicas found in the East. Havelock, AKS, 75. Salathé corroborates that small scale pudica figures were found in the east but the real question is where were the large scale replicas of the Medici and Capitoline copies found? Salathé, RWPV, 156.

114 For the dating of the Great Altar of Pergamon based on stamped amphora handles and fragments of long-petal bowls see Uhlenbrock, The Coroplast’s Art, 29-30.

115 Boardman, GSLCP, 73; Teun Velders, “Venus, From Fertility Goddess To Sales Promoter” (VFGSP), Review
The mirror is the more typical attribute of prudence, although Hans Baldung Grien (ca. AD 1484-85) showed her as a nude woman, not in the pudica pose, standing on a snake which represents ignorance.


Havelock, *AKS*, 79, mentions the pose being used by Masaccio, van Eyck, Botticelli and Dürer. The Dürer she probably refers to is a drawing done in 1493, in which the female figure covers her breast but not her genitals. The more famous Eve by Dürer does not use the pudicapose. For the sketch by Dürer, see <http://employees.oneonta.edu/farberas/arth/arth214_folder/durer_human_fig.html>/Titian_Venus_urbino.html

Titian finished the background and a cupid although the cupid was eventually painted over, and is now only visible with X-ray technology. David Rosand, “So-And-So Reclining on Her Couch,” in *Titian’s Venus of Urbino*, ed. Rona Goffen, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 43. Quoted in “Titian’s Venus of Urbino”, one of the academic Web pages of Prof. Allen Farber, University of New York, Oneonta. There is no indication of where an excerpt ends or when Prof. Farber’s own thoughts are interjected (if at all); Prof. Farber’s Web page is available at <http://employees.oneonta.edu/farberas/arth/arth213>

At least one of these copies was created ca. 1666-73 by Jean-Jacques Clerion (ca AD 1640-1714) and is currently at the chateaux de Versailles, Versailles, France.

Personal Correspondence (E-mail) Patricia L. Kahle, Director, Shadows-on-the-Teche, “Re: Garden Sculpture.” The sculpture was “...put there (we believe) by Weeks Hall...” and appears “...in some of the earliest photos of the garden by I.A. Martin, circa 1923.” (10 March 2004)

Velders, VFGSP, 118.

The prices for the large scale garden sculpture are based on prices at D&D Ornamental Concrete, 3372 Highway 308, Napoleonville, LA 70390. The prices for the small scale sculpture are based on prices at “Statue.com”, 100 N Main, Edwardsville, IL 62025 available at <http://www.statue.com/index.asp>

Velders, VFGSP, 113.
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937-223-5277 x 320
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______________________________
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Washington, DC 20565

Invoice & Black and White Photograph Contract # BW05-0004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Applicant's Letter</th>
<th>Date of this contract</th>
<th>Mail To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09/21/2004                | 10/02/2004           | Angel Alvarez  
2650 1st Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037 |

**This contract is between the National Gallery of Art (the "Gallery") and Angel Alvarez (the "Applicant") in response to the Applicant's request for black and white photographs. It is the Gallery's understanding that the purpose of the request is as follows: study/loan/published use.**

Subject to the terms, conditions and limitations below and on the reverse, permission is given to the Applicant for the following one-time use of the following works of art, one black and white photograph has been made available to the Applicant. Each photograph must be labeled:

--- ACCESS --- QTY --- DESCRIPTION ---

| $20.00 | 1 | 2015.101.6 (2-1765) | Cézanne; Still Life with Apples, 1907. Oil on canvas, 88.9 x 73.7 cm (35 x 29 in).  
Gift of the estate of Mrs. John Hay Brown.  
Inscribed on the back: Watercolor, red, in pencil.  
Signed: "Cézanne."  
1980.101.6 (2-1765) (WAM: 2015.101.6)  
1980.101.6 (2-1765) (WAM: 2015.101.6) |

**ACCESS --- MEDIA --- TOTAL ---

| $20.00 | - | $20.00 < PAYABLE |
| $20.00 | - | $20.00 < PAYABLE |
| $20.00 | - | $20.00 < PAYABLE |

The amount here represents the purchase of black and white photographs for sole use for the purpose specified above. Each photograph has been paid for in advance, any associated costs are included. The access fee applies whether or not the photographs are reproduced.

A copy of this contract signed by the applicant is on file with the Department of Visual Services.

The Applicant has agreed to comply with the terms and conditions herein, including on the reverse, and has further agreed to pay promptly all applicable fees.

Agreed: National Gallery of Art  
By:  
Date: 10-20-04  

Peter Mitas, Department of Visual Services, (202) 633-4307, fax: (202) 633-4176

Please note the contract number on any correspondence or payment pertaining to it.
PAYMENTS

When required, foreign currency, shipping and handling charges will be added to the amount to be paid. All payments must be made by check for the full amount of the purchase or by credit card. FEDERAL wire transfer must be approved by the applicant. Check or money order must be payable to the National Gallery of Art. All checks must be in U.S. currency.

SHIPPING INSTRUCTIONS

If required, the Gallery will ship purchased images or other materials to the applicant at the applicant's expense. The applicant must provide a complete mailing address and indicate the method of delivery. For large shipments, the Gallery may require the applicant to pay for insurance and handling.

TERM AND PERMISSIONS

1. The copyright or other rights in the images and other materials in this document are owned by the National Gallery of Art and are protected by domestic and international copyright laws. No part of this document may be reproduced, transmitted, or stored in any electronic or mechanical form without the written permission of the National Gallery of Art.

2. Permission is granted to use the images and other materials in this document for the specific purpose of the transaction for which payment has been made. The Gallery reserves the right to withdraw permission at any time for any reason.

3. The use of the images and other materials in this document is subject to the Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials. The Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials are available online and may be obtained by contacting the Gallery.

4. The Gallery does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or reliability of any information contained in this document and shall not be responsible for any errors or omissions in such information.

5. The Gallery shall not be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, or consequential damages, whether in an action of contract, negligence, or other tort, arising out of or in connection with the use of or reliance on any information contained in this document.

6. Photographs of the images and other materials in this document may be used for the purposes of promotion and advertising, provided that the photographs are used in a manner that is consistent with the Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials.

7. The Gallery reserves the right to refuse to grant permission for the use of the images and other materials in this document if the use is not consistent with the Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials.

8. The Gallery reserves the right to withdraw permission for the use of the images and other materials in this document at any time for any reason.

9. The Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials are subject to change without notice.

10. This document contains images and other materials that are protected by copyright laws. The use of these images and other materials is subject to the Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials.

11. The Gallery reserves the right to收取 payment for the use of the images and other materials in this document.

12. The Gallery reserves the right to terminate this permission at any time for any reason.

13. The Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials are available online and may be obtained by contacting the Gallery.

14. The Gallery reserves the right to refuse to grant permission for the use of the images and other materials in this document if the use is not consistent with the Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials.

15. The Gallery reserves the right to withdraw permission for the use of the images and other materials in this document at any time for any reason.

16. The Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials are subject to change without notice.

17. This document contains images and other materials that are protected by copyright laws. The use of these images and other materials is subject to the Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials.

KEY TO AVAILABILITY ENCOUNTER

- "Low" indicates that the materials are not available for the requested use or format.
- "High" indicates that the materials are available for the requested use or format.
- "Medium" indicates that the materials are available for the requested use or format, but with restrictions.
- "Not Available" indicates that the materials are not available for the requested use or format.

This document contains images and other materials that are protected by copyright laws. The use of these images and other materials is subject to the Gallery's terms and conditions for the use of the images and other materials.
The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ("MFA") is pleased to grant you, Angel Arvello (the "Licensee") limited permission, in accordance with the terms and conditions of this letter (this "Agreement"), to use the following image, hereinafter referred to as MFA Authorized Image(s) and/or graphic(s) (the "Authorized Image(s)") of the work described below (the "Work").

1. Art Object:
   
   **Naxos, Portrait of a Woman**, limestone, 4th century B.C.
   
   **Measurements**: Height 42 cm, Width 26 cm.
   
   The Work:
   
   **Museum**: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
   
   **Location**: Naxos, Greece

2. Art Object:
   
   **Eden, Portrait of a Woman**, limestone, 4th century B.C.
   
   **Measurements**: Height 42 cm, Width 26 cm.
   
   The Work:
   
   **Museum**: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
   
   **Location**: Greece

3. Art Object:
   
   **The葵工, Portrait of a Woman**, limestone, 4th century B.C.
   
   **Measurements**: Height 42 cm, Width 26 cm.
   
   The Work:
   
   **Museum**: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
   
   **Location**: Naxos, Greece

Subject to the Agreement, the MFA grants you non-exclusive permission to use the Authorized Image(s) to reproduce, publish and distribute the Work in the manner set forth above, in accordance with the following terms and conditions:

- **Use**: The authorized use may only be made for the purposes of promoting the work and its subsequent exhibition.
- **Distribution**: The authorized use may only be made through the Licensee's own channels.
- **Credit**: The Licensee must give proper credit to the MFA in all published material that includes the Authorized Image(s).
- **Renewal**: The Agreement is subject to renewal at the discretion of the MFA.
- **Termination**: The Agreement is terminated upon the completion of the use period or upon written notice from the MFA.

Any violation of the terms and conditions set forth above shall result in the immediate termination of the Agreement and the MFA's right to any unauthorized use.

The MFA reserves the right to revoke this Agreement in its entirety if the Licensee fails to comply with the terms and conditions set forth above.

This Agreement is governed by the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, without regard to its conflict of laws provisions. Any dispute arising out of or in connection with this Agreement shall be submitted to the MFA for resolution. The MFA's decision shall be final and binding upon the Licensee.

In consideration of the Authorized Image(s), the Licensee agrees to pay the MFA a royalty fee of $500.00 for each use of the Authorized Image(s). This fee is due and payable upon execution of this Agreement.

The MFA reserves the right to audit the Licensee's use of the Authorized Image(s) and to require the Licensee to furnish such information and documentation as the MFA deems necessary to verify the Licensee's compliance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

This Agreement is binding upon the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns.
From: Claus Grenne
To: aarvello@mindspring.com
Date: 9/24/2004 2:39:44 AM
Subject: Permission granted

From: Angel Arvello [mailto:aarvello@mindspring.com]
Sent: 24. september 2004 04:30
To: Viola, Hults
Emme: Permission to use photograph
Dear Angel,

I am happy to grant you permission to publish the photograph in question. If you need a newer photograph, bw or colour, do not hesitate to contact me again.

Looking forward to hearing from you again. I remain

Yours sincerely,

Claus Grenne
Curator, Archives and Library,
Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek
Danes Plads 7
DK-1556 Copenhagen V
Denmark
Tel: +45 33 18 14 11, fax: +45 33 32 20 38

I am currently writing my M.A. thesis for Louisiana State University
on the Medici type and am requesting permission to use a photograph of
the head of the Knidia that goes with the torso in the Musee Royaux d'Art et
(a copy of the photo is attached) I am also writing the Musee Royaux d'Art et D'Histoire
for permission, it would also be helpful to have the inventory number for the head.
The thesis will not be published but would be available in PDF format viewable only
from campus computers indefinitely. Credit, of course, will be given.
Permission may be granted by filling out the bottom portion of this email
and returning it to me. If you have other requirements please email.
Thank you,
Sincerely,
Ms Angel Arvello
aarvello@mindspring.com

The above request is approved providing proper credit is given.
Approved by: Claus Grenne, Curator, Archives and Library, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
Date: 24.09.04

file:C:\Documents%20and%20Settings\AngelL\Local%20Settings\Temp\EUP6D5.tmp
From: Marcia Erickson
To: a.arvello@mindspring.com
Date: November 05, 2004 9:20 PM
Subject: RE: Reproduction Rights Addendum

Permission is given.

From: Angel Arvello [mailto:a.arvello@mindspring.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 06, 2004 9:20 PM
To: Marcia Erickson@mindspring.com, Marcia.Erickson@LSU.EDU
Subject: Reproduction Rights Addendum

Reproduction Rights Addendum

To my previous request for the reproduction rights to use the image, I am hereby granted that the image could only be viewed from campus computers. This was incorrect and the thesis will be accessible from any computer with internet capability. I simply need to know if this is acceptable in an email. A response to this email is sufficient to grant any permission.

Best, Angel Arvello
Louisiana State University

Dear Marcia Arvello

Permission is granted for the pictures requested. No forms with signatures are required.

Here is the accession number: Unknown, Text of Aphrodite [S.639.34.1].

The head was attached to the body of the Aphrodite of Cyrene in March 1961.

For further information on that, Mary Ellen Soles is your best source.

Sincerely,

Marcia Erickson
Assistant Registrar Rights and Permissions
October 4, 2004

From: Mary Ellen Soles
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 9:42 AM
To: Marcia Erickson
Subject: RE: Permission to use photographs

This falls in your court, I believe.

From: Angel Arvello [mailto:a.arvello@mindspring.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2004 2:19 PM
To: msoles@ncmail.dcr.state.nc.us
Subject: Permission to use photographs

Re: Mary Ellen Soles

file://C:\Documents and Settings\Angel\Local Settings\Temp\6548B9-97-4118-49DD-803... 11/10/2004
I am currently writing my MA thesis for Louisiana State University on the Medici Aphrodite and am requesting permission to use the photographs of the body of the female in your collection. The photograph appeared in Edgar Boeck's "The North Carolina Museum of Art: Introduction to the Collections and Exhibition Venues" s Greek and Roman Sculpture in American Masterpieces in Public Collections in the United States and Canada. The inventory number would also be helpful. In addition, there is a copy of the Cyrene Aphrodite in your collection (Inventory # 40.5.1) that I would like to use. I am wondering about the need — the Museum's website shows the piece with a head although the original photograph I saw in Edgar Boeck's North Carolina Museum of Art shows the piece without a head. The piece will not be published and will be available in low format and could only be seen from computer monitors immediately. Credit, of course, will be given.

Permission may be granted by filling out the bottom portion of this email and returning it to me or please email me to let me know if any contracts/including agreements need to be signed.

Thank you
Sincerely

Angel Merello
g.merello@verizon.com

The above request is approved providing proper credit is given according to

[attachment]
From: Doug Smith
To: a.arvello@mindspring.com
Date: 11/6/2004 9:06:52 PM
Subject: Re: Reproduction Rights Addendum

This is acceptable.

Doug Smith

Please visit My Web Sites:
http://www.dougsmith.com/aboutme/
of my photos with a Canon D50:
http://www.dougsmith.com/d50.html
http://www.dougsmith.com/d50_1050.html

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Angel Arvello
To: Doug Smith
Sent: Saturday, November 06, 2004 9:16 PM
Subject: Reproduction Rights Addendum

Reproduction Rights Addendum

In my previous request for the reproduction rights to use
your photograph in my MA Thesis I stated that the thesis
would only be available from online repositories. This was incorrect
and the thesis will be accessible from any computer with Internet
availability. I simply need to know if this is acceptable or not.
A response to this email is sufficient to grant or deny permission.

Ms. Angel Arvello
Louisiana State University

I have filled out the form below as requested and will BCC this to P.G. Burbules so that he
may contact you if he wishes. I attach a link to the image of my coin to confirm we are all
talking about the same coin
http://dougsmith.ancients.info/diavendo/phil.jpg

Most wishes on the thesis,
Doug Smith

Please visit My Web Sites
http://www.dougsmith.com/aboutme/
of my photos with a Canon D50:
http://www.dougsmith.com/d50_1050.html

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Angel Arvello
To: Doug Smith
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2004 2:38 PM
Subject: Permission to use photograph in MA Thesis

I received your email address from Prof. Patricia Lawrence. She had
told me to copy of your bronze coin from Niocopo, an Atium with Blackmanus
on the obverse and the Medusa type on the reverse.

file://C:\Documents and Settings\Angel\Local Settings\Temp\60513Bb6-F1BA-4520-B4... 11/10/2004
I am finishing my MA thesis on the Bedini type and am requesting permission to use your photograph of your coin. The thesis will not be published but would be available in PDF format viewable only from campus computers indefinitely. Credit, of course, will be given.

Paul Lawrence also mentioned D. C. Burleigh having the same note. So if you have contact info on him I would appreciate it so that I could request permission to use his note also.

Permission may be granted by filling out the bottom portion of this email and returning it to me.

Thank you.

Angel Arevalo

The above request is approved providing proper credit is given.

Approved by: Douglas D. Smith
Date: 23 Sep 04
From: PGBurbules
To: a.arvello@mindspring.com
Date: 9/27/2004 8:47:01 PM
Subject: Re: Permission to use photograph in MA Thesis

In a message dated 9/27/2004 9:39:48 PM Eastern Daylight Time, a.arvello@mindspring.com writes:

Thank you for the email, however I am not sure if the process is still as simple as it once was.

After the original email letter I emailed Todd Smith.
You simply have to get your name and date at the bottom and then return it to me.

I am finishing my MA thesis on the Maccar type and am requesting permission to use your photograph of your coin. The thesis will not be published but would be available in PDF format viewable only from campus computers indefinitely. Credit of course, will be given.

Permission may be granted by filling out the bottom portion of this email and returning it to me.

Thank you,
Angel Arvello

The above request is approved providing proper credit is given.
approved by: Peter G. Burbules
Date: 27 September 2004

---

From: PGBurbules
To: a.arvello@mindspring.com
Date: 11/7/2004 3:43:55 PM
Subject: Re: Reproduction Rights Addendum

You still have my permission.

Good luck,
Peter G. Burbules
Akropolis Ancient Coins
VITA

Angel Denise Arvello was born in Montgomery, Alabama, to Daisy Triche Arvello, an RN, and Paul Arvello who served in the Air Force for most of his life. Most of her childhood and teenage years were spent in Hammond, Louisiana, and her formal training in art started at the age of 10 when she attended art classes at the Hammond Recreation Center. Her interest in art continued in High School and after graduating she moved to New York to continue her studies. She received an Associates Degree from the Fashion Institute of Technology in fashion illustration in 1990. She returned to Louisiana to receive her bachelor’s in visual arts in 1996. Inspired by art history professors at both FIT and SLU she began her studies in art history at LSU in 1998. She hopes to attend the American School of Classical Studies at Athens to continue her studies in the near future. She can be contacted by email at a.arvello@mindspring.com or aarvello@yahoo.com