A COLOSSAL STATUE OF A PERSONIFICATION
FROM THE AGORA OF ATHENS

(Plates 29–36)

THE FEMALE TORSO Athenian Agora S 2370 was found in the excavations of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens in May 19701 (Pl. 29). It was embedded

1 I am most grateful to Professor T. L. Shear, Jr. for permission to publish the Agora torso and for his constant encouragement and advice. Dr. D. Peppas-Delmouso has kindly allowed me to examine the relief E.M. 2811 and the statue base E.M. 3913. My thanks are also due to Dr. A. Delivorrias, Professors J. Boardman, E. B. Harrison, C. Houser, C. M. Robertson, H. A. Thompson, and Dr. G. B. Waywell for various suggestions and to Nicos and Theodoros Scaris for technical advice. All mistakes are my own. For the use of the Library of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens I am indebted to Professor H. R. Immerwahr and Dr. N. A. Winter. Photographs of Plates 29:d, 30 are by Alan Walker; Plate 36:e by Tasos Tanoulas; Plate 33:d, e by the German Archaeological Institute, Athens, neg. 72/444, 72/450, 72/452, here reproduced courtesy of Dr. Doris Pinkwart; Plate 34:b by the German Archaeological Institute, Rome, neg. 64/881; Plates 32:a, b, 34:a, c by Alinari (26976, 6576, 24310, 22767); Plate 33:c after Guerrini, Studi Miscellanei 22, 1974/75, pl. 25; the rest of the photographs are provided courtesy of the museums named in the captions.

The following special abbreviations will be used below:

Agora III = R. E. Wycherley, The Athenian Agora, III, Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia, Princeton 1957
Bieber, Copies = M. Bieber, Ancient Copies, New York 1977
Conze = A. Conze, Die attischen Grabreliefs, Berlin 1893–1922
Diepolder = H. Diepolder, Die attischen Grabreliefs, Berlin 1931
Guerrini = L. Guerrini, Studi Miscellanei 22, 1974/75
Hamdorf = F. W. Hamdorf, Griechische Kultpersonifikationen, Mainz 1964
Hausmann = U. Hausmann, Kunsthistorisches Bild, Potsdam 1948
Horn, Gewandstatuen = R. Horn, Stehende weibliche Gewandstatuen in der Hellenistischen Plastik, Munich 1931
Lippold, HdArch = G. Lippold, Handbuch der Archäologie, III, i, Die Griechische Plastik, Frankfurt am Main 1950
Palagia, Euphranor = O. Palagia, Euphranor, Leiden 1980
Svoronos = J. N. Svoronos, Τὸ ἔν Αθήναις Εθνικῶν Μουσείων, Athens 1908–1937

S 2370: Pres. height, 1.54 m. Est. original height, ca. 2.95 m. Height of chest from lower part of neckline to knot of girdle, 0.348 m.; right shoulder to girdle, 0.527 m.; right shoulder to hip, 0.833 m.; length of left upper arm to elbow, 0.59 m. L. Beschi, “Divinità funerarie cirenaiche,” ASAtene 47–48, n.s. 31–32, 1969/70, p. 237, no. 1; T. L. Shear, Jr., Hesperia 40, 1971, pp. 270–271, pl. 55; M. E. Caskey, “News Letter from Greece,” AJA 75, 1971, p. 296, pl. 73:7; H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, The Athenian Agora, XIV, The Agora of Athens, Princeton 1972, p. 84; Guerrini, pp. 109–110, pls. 24, 26–28; Thompson, Guide, pp. 204–205, fig. 37; E. B. Harrison, “The Shoulder-Cord of Themis,” Festschrift F.
face up in the foundations of a Byzantine house (Pl. 31:b), about one meter east of the conglomerate foundations of a pedestal measuring $2 \times 2.75$ m., of the third quarter of the 4th century B.C., aligned with the axis of the Royal Stoa.² The sculptural type of our torso belongs to a series of female figures in thin, high-girt chiton or, rarely, peplos and large himation, current from the decade 340–330 to the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.³ The findspot of S 2370 as well as its colossal size, which suggests that it may not have been moved far from its original position, prompted the excavators to assign it to the contemporary base in front of the Stoa (Pl. 31:a). The truncated state of our torso, however, allows some room for speculation about its original location.

S 2370 is of one piece of Pentelic marble of excellent quality. The head and neck with the upper part of the chest, now missing, were carved separately, not necessarily of different marble, and inset into a cavity measuring $0.35 \times 0.30$ m., marked with a claw chisel. The left forearm, now lost, was doweled into a rectangular socket measuring $0.046 \times 0.025$ m., 0.052 deep (Pl. 30:d);⁴ missing are most of the right arm, the hands, and the lower half of the legs with the feet. The surface dressed for the joint of the left forearm has become irregular and glossy with wear, perhaps from frequent handling. The statue may have been left standing without its forearm for a time, the join being at an accessible height; or, alternatively, it may have been buried but with the stump of the arm exposed. There is a small dowel hole on top of the left shoulder and a slightly larger one in the left forearm, at a distance of 0.423 m. from the first, for the insertion of a metallic attribute in the shape of a rod or staff held in the crook of the arm and resting on the shoulder (Pl. 30:c). This shape suggests a scepter, a spear, a key or perhaps a cubit.⁵ It is possible that both arm and attribute may have been lost


⁴ Other 4th-century instances of head and neck carved separately and inserted into a cavity include sculptures of the Mausoleum, Waywell, Mausoleum, p. 64; Demeter of Knidos (head of same marble as the body), B. Ashmole, “Demeter of Cnidus,” JHS 71, 1951, pp. 13–14; Sisyphos I at Delphi, S. Adam, The Technique of Greek Sculpture, London 1966, p. 101; Apollo Patroos of Euphranor, Palagia, Euphranor, p. 14; head of Zeus, Boston, M.F.A. 04:12, M. B. Comstock and C. C. Vermeule, Sculpture in Stone, Boston 1976, no. 44. See also Athens N.M. 231 from Rhamnous (Pl. 33d: e), footnote 37 below. Separately carved left forearms can be found in the Mausoleum sculptures, Sisyphos I and Demeter of Knidos.

⁵ A scepter, as held by Plouton on hydra by the Painter of London E 183, British Museum E 183, ARV², p. 1191, no. 1; M. P. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion I, 3rd ed., Munich 1976, p. 42. Compare also Idries on the relief from Tegea, British Museum, no. 1914.7–14.1, B. Ashmole, “Solvitur Disputando,” Festschrift F. Brommer, Mainz 1977, p. 16, pl. 8:2; Waywell, Mausoleum, p. 71; Palagia, Euphranor, p. 44.
in the sack of Sulla in 86 B.C., or, more likely, in the Herulian invasion of A.D. 267. The uniform weathering of most of the surface, the heavier damage of the shoulders, and the careful finish of the back show that the statue stood in the open air, all sides exposed to view, especially the front and right. Traces of mortar remain on the right shoulder.

The figure stands erect, confronting the spectator, shoulders level, right leg relaxed, the swinging hips disguised by pendent drapery. She wears a clinging chiton allowing the breasts and navel to show through. A cord is fastened across the shoulders and another is girt high above the waist, forming a knot. A bulky himation is wrapped around her left shoulder and arm, covering her back but for the right shoulder, and folded in front over the lower belly and the legs. It is taut over the left thigh and once formed a series of transverse folds from the left hip to the now lost right ankle. The delicate ridges of the chiton are severely damaged on the breasts; the himation, modeled by a great variety of drill channels, is battered at the back of the neckline, on top of the left shoulder, at the side of the left thigh, and along the edges of its most prominent folds, particularly those bunched at the hips. Its folds are shallower on top of the left shoulder but very detailed on the left arm, indicating that it was not covered by the attribute on this side. The sculptor knew how to spare his labor: witness the lack of chiton folds on the right hip, once obscured by the arm. Crease marks are scarce at the front of the himation but form a regular network at the back, indicating that the garment had often been folded up for storage. There is also part of the right sleeve, with the arm showing in between the four buttons, the flesh smooth but not polished (Pl. 29:d). No trace of hair is left on the shoulders.

The chiton is modeled in front by ridges cutting vertically across the nude torso, growing faint where the cloth is tight over the breasts and belly; their bottom tips follow the slight sway of the hips. Those on the proper right side of the dress are denser as well as flimsier and abut directly on the girdle, while those on the left are wider apart, set off by drill channels above and below it (Pl. 30:b). This idiosyncratic difference of technique may betray two hands at work, the better sculptor at the right side, an assistant at the left. The latter may also be detected in the delineation of the girdle at the back. We are clearly not dealing with one of the great masters. The monotonous symmetry of the transparent drapery is broken by a rippling pattern produced by the loose, V-shaped folds falling between the breasts (Pl. 30:a). This is paralleled in the closely related Hygieia on the votive relief Athens N.M. 1335, of ca. 330–325 B.C. (Pl. 31:c), and in two similar contemporary types transmitted through

---


6 The transparency harks back to high Classical models, as described by R. Carpenter, *Greek Sculpture*, Chicago 1960, pp. 139–140.


8 From the Athenian Asklepieion, Svoronos, pl. 36:4; *IG* II², 4402; Hausmann, p. 178, no. 145; Palagia, “Torso,” pl. 21:b; G. Neumann, *Probleme des griechischen Weihereliefs*, Tübingen 1979, p. 54, pl. 45:a.
Roman copies, one as Hygieia,9 the other as Agathe Tyche (Pl. 32:a, b).10 It may well be argued that at least the earliest instances of this motif issued from a single workshop. Echoes of it may be found in the Etruscan “Spinner”11 and the orans copies in the priestess British Museum no. 1988 (Pl. 32:c),12 Agrippina the Younger at Olympia,13 and a Trajanic torso from Cyrene;14 both types are more or less derived from prototypes of the late third quarter of the 4th century B.C. Apart from the rippled neckline,15 which is confined to the last decades of the century, crinkly dress in general was fashionable throughout the Hellenistic period. Rippled chiton sleeves and himation are displayed on the torso from Halikarnassos, Louvre no. 2838.16 The Attic funerary statue Louvre no. 926,17 dated ca. 325 B.C. by comparison with the stele of Demetria and Pamphile at the Kerameikos,18 a funerary torso from Cyrene of ca. 300 B.C.,19 and the statue Piraeus Museum no. 3637, perhaps contemporary,


10 This type was studied in detail by Kabus-Jahn, Studien, pp. 33–38, pl. 7. See also Hamdorf, T 319; Guerrini, p. 110, note 10. The best copy is in Paris, from Ste. Colombe-les-Vienne, Kabus-Jahn, Studien, pl. 7; the best known ones are in the Vatican, Braccio Nuovo 59 (Pl. 32:a), 74, and 86 (Pl. 32:b). W. Amelung, Die Skulpturen des Vatschischen Museums I, Berlin 1903–1908, nos. 79, 92–93, 101–103, pls. 9, 11, 13; Helbig4, no. 437. Their heads do not belong; attributes were added by the copyists.

11 From Vulci, Munich Glyptothek no. 444, A. Furtwängler, Beschreibung der Glyptothek, Munich 1910, pp. 392–393, no. 444; Lippold, HdArch, p. 266, note 2, pl. 86:4; Kabus-Jahn, Studien, pp. 31–32; Palagia, Euphranor, p. 31, note 144, fig. 55.


14 Bieber, Copies, p. 200, note 143, fig. 823.


16 Allegedly from the ruins of the Mausoleum; its exact findspot cannot now be determined. Its sandals with indented soles also occur on two fragments from the Mausoleum, Waywell, Mausoleum, nos. 209, 210; for other 4th-century examples, cf. ibid., p. 71, also the Piraeus Athena, Palagia, Euphranor, pp. 20–23, figs. 32, 33, and its copy, the Athena Mattei, ibid., figs. 36, 37. Louvre 2838 was not included in the Mausoleum statuary by Waywell, who doubts that it belongs there. If it were part of the Mausoleum, one would have to allow for a gap of about twenty years between this and the next example of rippling in S 2370. Louvre 2838: E. Michon, “Statue de femme drapée provenant d’Halicarnasse,” BCH 17, 1893, pp. 410–411; Lippold, HdArch, p. 260, note 2; J. Charbonneaux, La sculpture grecque et romaine au musée du Louvre, Paris 1963, p. 46; M. Bieber, Entwicklungs geschichte der griech. Tracht, 2nd ed., Berlin 1967, fig. 23.

17 M. Collignon, Les statues funéraires, Paris 1911, pp. 158–159, fig. 90.

18 Diepolder, pl. 51:1; Lippold, HdArch, p. 245, pl. 87:3; Bieber, Sculpture, p. 64, note 30.

19 Beschi, op. cit. (footnote 1 above), pp. 235–237, no. 29, fig. 72.
are early examples of a chiton rippled all over the breasts. Crinkly chiton folds emerging from under the bottom hem of the himation appear in both the Nike holding an oinochoe and the Dionysos on the tripod base Athens N.M. 1463, and the Sardanapalos, whose crinkly chiton is also visible on the right upper part of the chest. Crinkly chitons free of himatia are exemplified by the Artemis of Versailles and the statuettes of little girls from the late 4th and perhaps the early 3rd centuries B.C. (Pls. 32:d, e, 33:a).

The chiton of S 2370 is not transparent at the back; the profuse drapery there, marked by a haphazard distribution of light and shade, disguises the contours of the body and enhances the effect of realism (Pl. 30:e). This treatment heralds the casual, linear himatia of the Aischines and the philosopher Delphi no. 1819. Compare also the muffled figure on the nuptial lebes by the Marsyas Painter, Leningrad no. 15592. Our torso, mutilated as it is, retains a block-like character; its effect depends primarily on the playful contrast between tightly stretched and loosely hanging clothing, as well as between heavily and lightly clad parts: both fashions, the latter from the high Classical, lived on in the Hellenistic period. An outstanding Hellenistic example of transparent chiton is the torso Boston M.F.A. 97.286.

Roughly contemporary with the philosopher Delphi no. 1819 is an important variant of S 2370, one of a pair of colossal cult statues in the Delphi Museum that were recently found by Themelis in the temple of Demeter and Kore at Kallipolis in Aitolia. For a statue that had stood indoors, its surface is surprisingly weathered. The head, with neck, right arm and hand, and the left hand were carved separately. The stance and drapery, notably the rippled neckline and the shoulder cord of the Agora torso, are here retained, with a shift of emphasis

---

20 Svoronos, pl. 29:1 and 2.
22 Bieber, Copies, figs. 246–248.
25 Last quarter of the 4th or beginning of the 3rd century b.c., Fdd IV, pls. 69, 71; Kabus-Jahn, Studien, pp. 43, 46–48; Waywell, Mausoleum, p. 69.
27 Comstock and Vermeule, op. cit. (footnote 4 above), no. 91.
in the proportions and the distribution of devices. The himation leaves the left upper arm exposed while covering the belly, which thus loses its prominence in the composition. The head, too small for the body, is crowned by long, wavy, classicizing hair; it is turned to the left in the direction of the other female statue that stood on the same base. The preserved right foot is shod in a strapless sandal with an indented sole. S 2370 is also repeated, with variations, in a Hellenistic statuette from the Sahara, Cairo Museum no. 27464. The back is roughly executed; the right forearm, carved separately, is missing. The hair is long and crowned with a diadem; the position of the limbs is reversed. The chiton, rather thick, is girt high under the breasts and cross girt over the shoulders; the ripped neckline is clumsily reproduced. Closely related to S 2370 is the fragment Acropolis Museum 930. Finally, the right side of the chiton of the colossal Athenian Agora S 378 of the 2nd century b.c. seems to derive directly from our torso (Pl. 32:f).

The drapery and stance of S 2370 are faithfully copied in a colossal Tyche (Pl. 33:c) of Pentelic marble from the unfinished Forum of Severus in Leptis Magna, evidence that the original in the Athenian Agora was still standing in the first decade of the 3rd century after Christ. She differs primarily in the absence of the shoulder cord, the locks of hair on her shoulders, and the addition beside her right foot of a globe topped by a rudder, with a connecting strut at the side of her leg, and a cornucopia, once resting on a specially dressed surface in the crook of her left arm. The left forearm and hand were carved separately and are now missing. The feet, bottom hem of the himation, and the globe are unfinished, an indication that the figure was carved on the spot, perhaps by Attic masons, known to have worked in the Forum. The roughly sketched-out back was probably not meant to be seen, but it may also have been left incomplete. The folds of her drapery are coarse and linear, having been mechanically reproduced. The striking fidelity of the copy prompts a restoration of the missing legs of S 2370 along similar lines, the himation reaching to the ankles, covering the bottom of the chiton, both legs modeled under the closely draped garments. Sweeping stretch folds extend from the left hip to the right foot, at an angle to the cloth bunched at the hips. The center of gravity is placed high, the legs appearing rather long in proportion to the torso, thus imparting an air of elegance to the massive figure. This treatment of the lower part of the figure has close parallels from the 330’s to the end of the 4th century B.C. in Rheboulas on the relief Athens N.M. 1476, of 331/0 (Pl. 33:b), the orans

29 C. C. Edgar, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire: Greek Sculpture, Cairo 1903, p. 15, pl. 7.
33 From the decree honoring Rheboulas, found in the Athenian Asklepieion. IG II², 349; R. Binnebössel, Studien zu den attischen Urkundenreliefs, diss. Leipzig, 1932, no. 62; Brown, op. cit. (footnote 23 above), p. 26, fig. 83; M.-A. Zagdoun, FdD, IV, vi, Reliefs, Paris 1977, p. 55, fig. 33.
Delphi no. 1817, the variants of a Kore type also known from the relief Eleusis 11/5061, and the orans copied in British Museum no. 1988 (Pl. 32:c).

S 2370 was probably the original source for a work of inferior quality, the Themis Athens N.M. 231 from the temple of Themis at Rhamnous, by the Rhamnousian Chairestratos son of Chairedemos (Pl. 33:d, e). This is an eclectic piece, contaminated with the orans type British Museum no. 1988 (Pl. 32:c) or others of the same kind, whence comes the triangle made by the cross fold of the himation caught under the left arm. This cross fold, presupposing a gesture of prayer or adoration, is embellished in the middle by an incongruous rosette-shaped bundle after an earlier 4th-century device. Her chiton is scarred by

34 FdD IV, pl. 72; Horn, Gewandstatuen, p. 20, note 2; Kabus-Jahn, Studien, pp. 46–48; Waywell, Mausoleum, p. 71; Palagia, Euphranor, p. 45. Last quarter of the 4th century B.C.


36 See p. 102 and footnotes 12–14 above.

37 Height, 2.22 m. Pentelic marble. Dedicated to Themis by Megakles. No attributes survive. Her identity was questioned by T. B. L. Webster (Hellenistic Art, London 1967, p. 64), who suggested she might be just an attendant offered to the goddess; her affinity to orans types is indeed striking and might be significant. The sculptor Chairestratos or his grandfather appears as a Councillor in a decree from the Amphaiareion of Oropos of 328/7 B.C. (B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, The Athenian Agora, XV, The Athenian Councillors, Princeton 1974, no. 49). Chairedemos of Rhamnous, the sculptor’s father(?), is mentioned in IG II², 2766 of 315/4 B.C. For another signature of Chairestratos see J. Marçadcé, Recueil des signatures des sculpteurs grecs I, Paris 1953, p. 11. The dry, classifying style and dull drapery of the Themis are close to Hygieia on two reliefs from ca. 300 B.C., Athens N.M. 1330 (Pl. 34:a), Susserott, p. 123, pl. 25:3; Hausmann, p. 178, no. 144, and Louvre no. 755 (Pl. 34:c), Susserott, p. 123, pl. 25:4; Hausmann, p. 178, no. 146, fig. 5; Neumann, op. cit. (footnote 8 above), p. 54, pl. 44:b. For the Themis see B. Staïs, “Ἀγάλματα ἐκ Ραμνών,” Ἐφ’ Ἀρχ’, 1891, pp. 45–51, pl. 4; IG II²/III², 3109; Carpenter, op. cit. (footnote 30 above), pp. 63–65; A. Wilhelm, “Themis und Nemesis in Rhamnus,” Ὀψ 32, 1940, pp. 200–201; Lipplold, HDArch, p. 302, pl. 108:1; Marçadcé, op. cit., p. 12, pl. 4:3; L. Ascher, Griechische Plastik IV, 1957, pp. 28–29, figs. 4, 5; Ch. Picard, Manuel d’archéologie, IV, La sculpture, Paris 1963, p. 1160; Kabus-Jahn, Studien, pp. 48–50; Brown, op. cit. (footnote 23 above), pp. 65–66, fig. 97; Robertson, op. cit. (footnote 12 above), p. 459, fig. 146:b; Ashmole, op. cit. (footnote 5 above), p. 19, note 32; Harrison, op. cit. (footnote 1 above), p. 157, note 17, pl. 43:1; J. Frel, GettyMus 6–7, 1978–79, pp. 75–82, figs. 2, 4, 5, 8.

38 This device was reintrepreted in the 2nd century B.C., cf. statues from Pergamon in Berlin, Horn, Gewandstatuen, pp. 59–60, pl. 22:2; Bieber, Sculpture, p. 133, note 60, fig. 518. Repeated in Roman portraits, after a variety of models: Corinth no. 813, F. P. Johnson, Corinth, IX, Sculpture, 1896–1923, Cambridge, Mass. 1931, no. 10; Fundilia, Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, F. Poulsen, Catalogue of Ancient Sculpture, Copenhagen 1951, no. 537; Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, Billedtavler til Kataloget over Antike Kunstvaerker, Copenhagen 1907, pl. 41; Bieber, Copies, pp. 200–210, fig. 830; “Livia”, Naples, ibid., p. 23, fig. 17. See also the recently discovered funerary torso from Patras, Agallopoulo, Δελτάτ 29, 1973–1974, B’ 2 [1979], p. 400, pl. 257:a. The triangular cross fold has sometimes been deemed suspect, and British Museum no. 1988 with the other copies (p. 102 and footnotes 12–14 above) relegated to Roman concoctions, cf. Horn, Gewandstatuen, p. 95; Kabus-Jahn, Studien, p. 50; Bieber, Copies, pp. 199–200.

39 The rosette in 4th-century himation is formed by cloth bunched either between the bent arm and the flank (cf. Athens N.M. 966, Diepolder, pl. 43:2; Athens N.M. 832, Conze, no. 337, pl. 85; Athens N.M. 870, Diepolder, pl. 47; N. Himmelmann-Wildschütz, Studien zum Ilissos-Relief, Munich 1956, pp. 24–25, figs. 21, 22, 24; New York M.M.A. 36.11.11, Richter, Catalogue of Greek Sculpture, Cambridge, Mass. 1954, no. 80, pl. 65; lekythos, Munich Glyptothek no. 498, Diepolder, pl. 34) or under the arm folded over the belly (stele of Demetria and Pamphile, cf. footnote 18 above) or behind the leg of a seated figure pressed against the
tightly packed crinkly folds, modeled by wavy furrows alternating with sharply cut ridges, reminiscent of the chiton at our torso’s back. She retains the shoulder cord and girdle, here placed higher under the breasts, without knot. There are striped traces of coloring on the himation below the knees. The drapery carries rasp marks all over, contrasting with the ganosis of the nude parts. Her head, neck, and upper part of the chest were carved separately of the same marble as the rest and inserted into a cavity, in much the same way as in S 2370. Her right forearm and left hand were also separately attached and her ears pierced for the addition of metallic earrings. Her strapless sandals may well be attributed to the general slackness of workmanship. The back is treated in summary fashion as she was meant to stand in the corner at the back of the cella in line with other votive statues.\textsuperscript{40}

As the stance of S 2370 is here closely reproduced, we may confidently restore her right arm by the side, free of the body. Themis’ head and hairstyle may equally well derive from S 2370. Her vague, puffy face has a girlish expression, somewhat alleviated by Venus rings betraying the onset of maturity. Her triangular forehead, crowned with short, wavy locks combed vertically above it and exposing most of the ears, and the depression around the head, perhaps an imitation of the imprint of a headband, also occur in the Boston Aphrodite riding a goose, of the decade 330–320 B.C.,\textsuperscript{41} and in seated matrons on Attic grave reliefs after 340 B.C. (Pl. 35:a).\textsuperscript{42} A similar coiffure is worn by a figure related to S 2370 but in different style, the Artemis on the votive relief Athens N.M. 3917 (Pl. 35:b), which is datable soon after the Apollo Patroos of Euphranor (ca. 330 B.C.), here reproduced at the extreme left.\textsuperscript{43} The Artemis stands in a restless pose, a torch held diagonally across her body, left leg bent instead of right, head turned left. She wears a non-transparent chiton, girt high with small kolpoi over the girdle, a quiver strap across her breasts. Her himation stops halfway down the shins, forming catenaries instead of stretch folds over the engaged leg. Despite the high waist, the horizontals are dominant.

chair (Munich Glyptothek no. 491, Clairmont, \textit{op. cit.} [footnote 5 above], no. 30, pl. 15); it may also be formed by the peplos tucked in the girdle (cf. Athens N.M. 1957, Diepolder, pl. 52:2; Conze, no. 335, pl. 77). From the late 4th century on it may be formed by himation folds bunched at the side of the hips, cf. Terme no. 11618 (Pl. 34:b) and examples in Horn, \textit{Gewandstatuen}, p. 19, note 3: S 2370 stands at the beginning of this mannerism; earlier still is N.M. 1440, Svoronos, pl. 72. It is interesting that similar bundles, variously arranged, occur in paintings by Guido Reni, cf. \textit{St. Michael and the Devil and Europa and the Bull}, D. S. Pepper, “A new late work by Guido Reni for Edinburgh and his later manner re-evaluated,” \textit{Burlington Magazine} 121, 1979, pp. 421, note 7, 432, note 21, figs. 20, 24.

\textsuperscript{40} Findspot illustrated in \textit{Εφ’ Αρχ}, 1891, pp. 45–46.

\textsuperscript{41} Boston M.F.A. 03.752, Comstock and Vermeule, \textit{op. cit.} (footnote 4 above), no. 43.


A possible workshop adaptation of S 2370 as Hygieia is represented by the Hygieia "Broadlands",\(^{44}\) attested for the last quarter of the 4th century by the leaning, cross-legged variation on Athens N.M. 1335 (Pl. 31:c). It is now impossible to judge which of the two types was created first. The best Roman copy of the Hygieia is in the Museo Nuovo:\(^{45}\) a snake coiled around her right arm must have drunk from a phiale in her left hand. Wavy locks of hair survive on her right shoulder. The rippled neckline is characteristically retained but the shoulder cord is omitted, though common for Hygieia on 4th-century reliefs. Her himation is lifted above her feet, exposing the lower part of the chiton.

Another variation of Hygieia, parallel to the "Broadlands" type, is transmitted by two late 4th-century reliefs (Athens N.M. 1396, where she is named, and a votive relief in Verona) and by two Roman statuettes.\(^{46}\) She differs significantly from the "Broadlands" type in the large triangular himation overfold, its apex pointing to the weight-bearing leg. This serves to articulate the lower part of the figure in three horizontal zones, far removed from the elongated appearance of the legs of the Leptis Tyche (Pl. 33:c). This Hygieia can be dated to ca. 330–320 B.C., by comparison with Eutaxia on the relief Athens N.M. 2958 (Pl. 35:c) and the middle nymph on N.M. 2012 (Pl. 35:e).\(^{47}\)

The variant with pointed overfold also occurs as Bona Fortuna in several copies, holding a rudder resting on a globe and a cornucopia (Pl. 32:a, b).\(^{48}\) Her prototype, as established by Kabus-Jahn, had long wavy hair parted in the middle, and, with the exception of a reduced replica, Terme 11618 (Pl. 34:b),\(^{49}\) wore no shoulder cord. Her affinity with S 2370 is enhanced by the colossal size, erect composure, and frontal aspect, as well as the peculiar neckline reproduced in a number of copies. Kabus-Jahn restores her original attributes as a phiale in the right hand and a cornucopia in the left, on the basis of comparison with Agathe Tyche on Ptolemaic oinochoai.\(^{50}\) There is, however, no evidence for the iconographical adaptation of this type as Tyche with cornucopia before the 3rd century B.C. An under-life-size 4th-century version in the Ashmolean Museum lacks the attributes (Pl. 35:d), while a

---

\(^{44}\) See p. 102 and footnote 9 above.

\(^{45}\) Inv. no. 1845. Height, 1.69 m. Parian marble. Headless. For bibliography see footnote 9 above. Several copies listed by Mustilli, to which add group with Asklepios in Moscow, P. C. Bol, "Die ‘Hippokrates-Statue’ in Kos," AntP 15, 1975, p. 69, note 14, fig. 10.


\(^{48}\) See footnote 10 above. For the attributes of Tyche see Dio Chrysostom, Orations, 63.7.

\(^{49}\) Height, 1.36 m. NSc: 11, 1914, p. 143, fig. 2; Kabus-Jahn, Studien, pp. 36–37, note 38.

derivative figure on the contemporary record relief Athens N.M. 1477 (Pl. 36:a), perhaps Agathe Tyche (invoked in the heading),\textsuperscript{51} holds two purses.

Comparison so far with other sculptures of the later part of the 4th century B.C., and particularly with the dated reliefs in Athens, N.M. 1335 (Pl. 31:c; 330–325 B.C.) and N.M. 1476 (Pl. 33:b; 331/0 B.C.), dates S 2370 to about 335–330 B.C. Its picturesque combinations of diversified drapery patterns and the slender proportions conform to a taste rather eclectic and self-conscious in its attempt to control realistic tendencies by incorporating them into earlier formalistic schemas. In S 2370 stir signs of the Plain Style of the early Hellenistic period, which spanned the last three decades of the 4th and the first quarter of the 3rd centuries B.C., culminating around 280 in portrait statues like those of Demosthenes and Nikeso of Priene.\textsuperscript{52} Its classicism is contrived and heralds the end of the Classical era, concurrent with innovative trends experimenting with blurred gradations, spiral torsion, and realistic renderings of texture. The full, balanced, clearly articulated forms of the 4th century begin to be simplified and restricted within the limits of the rectangular block. There is an effort to keep shoulders, hips, and feet level; textural contrasts are toned down or effected in limited areas; a vertical accent prevails, often as a result of elongated figures; the “good” views are reduced; there is a tension between line and volume, manifest in the conflict between the shallow draperies and the fully modeled bodies underneath.

Apart from S 2370 and its derivatives, a good representative of the Plain Style in differently arranged chiton and himation is the Kore in Vienna,\textsuperscript{53} related to the Sardanapalos;\textsuperscript{54} she appears also as a Hesperid on the Kerch hydria New York M.M.A. 24.97.5.\textsuperscript{55} The Athena from Castra Praetoria is a characteristic example of a peplos figure in the same trend,\textsuperscript{56} first attested (in Attic helmet and chiton-under-the-peplos) on the Euphron relief, Athens N.M. 1492, of 323–317 B.C.\textsuperscript{57}

The colossal size of S 2370 betrays a deity. The sculptural type, in various attitudes and hairstyles, with or without shoulder cord or pointed overfold, was used for Aphrodite, Artemis (Pl. 35:b), Demeter and Kore, the Muses (Pl.36:b) and nymphs (Pl. 35:e), and was particularly popular in personifications, such as Agathe Tyche (Pl. 32:a, b), Hygieia (Pl.

\textsuperscript{51} Ashmolean torso, Palagia, “Torso,” pp. 180–182, pl. 20; Athens N.M. 1477, relief on decree recording the leasing of property, from Piraeus; to be set up “by a hero”, here represented seated. Svoronos identified the female figure as Misthosis on the strength of the two purses. \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{2}, 2496; Svoronos, pp. 595–597, pl. 105.


\textsuperscript{54} Cf. footnote 21 above.


\textsuperscript{57} \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{2}, 448; \textit{SIG I}\textsuperscript{2}, 136, pl. 108; Süßerott, p. 67, pl. 9:4; Binnebössel, \textit{op. cit.} (footnote 33 above), no. 68; Lippold, \textit{HdArch}, p. 94:4; F. Mitchel, “Derkylos of Hagnous and the Date of I.G. II\textsuperscript{2}, 1187,” \textit{Hesperia} 33, 1964, p. 344, pl. 65:d; Palagia, \textit{Euphranor}, p. 62.
31:c), Eutaxia (Pl. 35:c), Boule (Pl. 36:d) and Demokratia (Pl. 36:c).\textsuperscript{58} It is therefore clear
that the identification of the Agora torso, found out of context and lacking the attributes, can only be conjectural.
It was at first deemed to have held a cornucopia, thereby distinguished as Agathe Tyche, on the analogy of Bona Fortuna with pointed overfold.\textsuperscript{59} The copy from
Leptis was brought in later as additional support for this view.\textsuperscript{60} A cornucopia held tightly
in the crook of her left arm is rendered unlikely, however, by the meticulous finish of this arm.
The attribute was attached to this side by means of tiny dowels that could not have projected further than about 0.05 m.
beyond the surface of the marble without becoming conspicuous; it is therefore doubtful that there rose a cornucopia at a distance from the
shoulder of torso S 2370. Original representations of Agathe Tyche from the 4th century
b.c. do not conform to any one type and none reproduces this one. Only Tyche in peplos
holds a cornucopia in the crook of her arm; Tyche in chiton either carries none or holds it in
both hands, or in the left only, its mouth away from her side. We have seen that a possible
Tyche in a type similar to S 2370 but with pointed overfold and holding two purses occurs
on the 4th-century relief Athens N.M. 1477 (Pl. 36:a).\textsuperscript{61} This, however, is more closely

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{58} 340–300 B.C.: Aphrodite: cf. Boston M.F.A. 03.752, footnote 41 above; grouped with Eros, from Daphni,
Kanta, Eleusis, Athens 1979, p. 71; statue from Kallipolis, footnote 28 above. Muses: cf. relief from Manti-
nea, Athens N.M. 216 (Pl. 36:b), seated Muse with trichordon (pandura), Süsserott, pl. 25:2; C. Picard,
Manuel d'archéologie, IV, i, La sculpture, Paris 1954, p. 361, fig. 157; M. Wegner, Musikgeschichte in
Agathe Tyche: see footnote 10 above and Panathenaic amphora Berlin 3980, Süsserott, pl. 11:2; K. Peters,
Studien zu den Panathenäischen Preisamphoren, Berlin 1942, pp. 105–106, pl. 12; see also footnote 62 below.
Hygieia: cf. Athens N.M. 1335, footnote 8 above; relief in Verona, footnote 46 above; see also Hausmann, pp.
N.M. 1473 (Pl. 36:d; wearing a peplos instead of a chiton), Svoronos, pl. 109; Athens N.M. 2404, Svoronos,
pl. 148:1; E.M. 2811 (323/2 B.C.; because of her damaged right arm, it is not possible to determine if she wore
a chiton with sleeves or a peplos), IG II\textsuperscript{3}, 367; C. Schweng, “The Relief of IG II\textsuperscript{3} 367,” AntK 19, 1976, pp.
64–66, pl. 14; Palagia, Euphranor, p. 62; Demokratia: Athenian Agora I 6524 (337/6 B.C.), B. D. Meritt,
AthMitt 94, 1979, pp. 59–61, pl. 8:2; Palagia, Euphranor, pp. 60–61, fig. 43; unidentified personification: Athens N.M. 1477 (Pl. 36:a), see footnote 51 above.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{59} Shear, op. cit. (footnote 1 above), pp. 270–271.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{60} Guerrini, pp. 110–113: a phiale was restored in the right hand of S 2370. Poor Roman reproductions of S
2370 as Tyche also occur in the Vatican, giardino della pigna 113, Amelung, op. cit. (footnote 10 above), p.
852, pl. 102; Florence, Museo Acheologico 13834, Kruse, op. cit. (footnote 15 above), p. 329, pl. 43.

without cornucopia, on relief base, Acropolis 4069, O. Walter, Beschreibung der Reliefs im kleinem
Akropolismuseum in Athen, Vienna 1923, no. 391; on votive relief, Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek no. 1558,
29, note 37, fig. 14. Tyche carrying cornucopia in both hands, on votive relief Athens N.M. 1343, Svoronos,
pp. 261–263, pl. 34:6; Süsserott, pp. 111–112, pl. 17:2; IG II\textsuperscript{3}, 4644; Hausmann, p. 180, no. 166. Tyche with
cornucopia in left hand, its mouth away from her shoulder (identification uncertain: distinguished by
cornucopia), Panathenaic amphora, Berlin 3980, see footnote 58 above. Tyche in high-girt peplos and
himation, carrying cornucopia in the crook of her left arm, on votive relief, Piraeus Museum, IG II\textsuperscript{3}, 4589; A.
Tyche on relief, Athens N.M. 1477, cf. footnote 51 above.
related to the type of Bona Fortuna (Pl. 32:a, b) that has already been discussed as a variant of S 2370. There is as yet no evidence that the exact type of the Agora torso was used to represent Tyche. The location suggested for it in front of the Royal Stoa, at any rate, need not detract from this attractive possibility. Agathe Tyche was an appropriate ornament to a public building; witness her statue,\(^{62}\) admittedly of unknown date, outside the Athenian Prytaneion.

The alleged association of the Agora torso with the Royal Stoa and its resemblance to the derivative Themis from Rhamnous (Pl. 33:d, e) have further prompted its identification with Themis.\(^{63}\) But there are grounds for doubting this, too. First, as has already been mentioned, the same type was adapted as Hygieia at an even earlier date. Second, the Rhamnous statue deviates from S 2370 in order to approximate an orans, and this might reflect a different iconographical tradition, or it may be due merely to the sculptor’s caprice. Harrison has ingeniously argued that the shoulder cord, normally worn by younger or active figures, was adopted by the matronly Themis as an attribute symbolizing restraint. Themis, however, was not always matronly (witness the statue from Rhamnous), and if Beazley’s identification is correct,\(^{64}\) Themis in the tondo of a red-figured cup by the Phiale Painter in Verona, Museo del Teatro Romano,\(^{65}\) wears an ungirt chiton and looks generally disorderly. Aphrodite (Athens N.M. 2167), Kore on the relief Eleusis 11/5061,\(^{66}\) and some personifications in the later part of the 4th century, for example Eutaxia (Pl. 35:c) and Demokratia (Pl. 36:c), favored the shoulder cord although not manifestly in need of one; even a replica of Bona Fortuna dons it.\(^{67}\) The cord is also retained by the early Hellenistic cult statue of Kore from Kallipolis. Pausanias’ (viii.25.6–7) care not to confuse the statue of Demeter Lousia with Themis warns us against belief in firmly established iconographical types. Of course, if we assume that S 2370 stood in front of the Royal Stoa, its identification with Themis appears remarkably apt. Themis as goddess of justice and good order and protectress of laws and oaths,\(^{68}\) who presided over the meetings of the gods,\(^{69}\) would have been a good guardian of the building where laws of Drakon and Solon were deposited,\(^{70}\) and where

\(^{62}\) Aelian, \(V H\) 9.39. Improbably identified with Agora S 37 by B. Vierneisel-Schlörb (\(Festschrift G. Kleiner, Tübingen 1976,\) p. 75, note 52, pl. 12:1), who dates it to the 4th century B.C. and restores it with a cornucopia in the left hand. S 37, however, was found at the southeast corner of the Metroon and its attributes are doubtful. The type is closer to an Aphrodite. For S 37 cf. also Thompson, \(Guide,\) pp. 191–192, 319; E. Bielefeld, “Ariadne Valentinii (sog. Aphrodite Valentinii),” \(AntP\) 17, 1978, p. 64, fig. 15.

\(^{63}\) Proposed in Thompson, \(Guide,\) pp. 204–205 and Harrison, \(op. cit.\) (footnote 1 above), p. 157.

\(^{64}\) \(ARV\)\(^2\), p. 1023, no. 148.

\(^{65}\) \(CVA,\) Verona 1 [Italy 34], 2 [1521].

\(^{66}\) For Aphrodite cf. footnote 58 above; Kore, footnote 35 above.

\(^{67}\) Cf. footnotes 58 and 49 above, respectively.

\(^{68}\) Diodoros, v.67. For Themis in general see R. Hirzel, \(Themis, Dike und Verwandt\)es, Leipzig 1907; V. Ehrenberg, \(Die Rechtsidee im frühen Griechenium,\) Leipzig 1921, pp. 3–53; Latte, \(RE\) 58, 1934, pp. 1626–1627, \(s.v.\) Themis; Weniger in Roscher, \(ML\) V, pp. 570–571, \(s.v.\) Themis; H. Vos, \(Ωέμε\), Assen 1956; Hamdorff, pp. 50–51, 108–110; F. Brommer, \(EAA VII,\) 1966, p. 811, \(s.v.\) Themis; H. Lloyd-Jones, \(The Justice of Zeus,\) Berkeley 1971, pp. 166–167, note 23; Harrison, \(op. cit.\) (footnote 1 above), pp. 155–156.

\(^{69}\) Homer, \(Odyssey\) ii.69; E. A. Havelock, \(The Greek Concept of Justice,\) Cambridge, Mass. 1978, p. 101.

\(^{70}\) Repository of laws of Solon, Aristotle, \(Athenaion Politeia,\) 7.1; Andokides, i.82, 84, 95. Laws of Drakon on homicide, \(IG I²,\) 115, lines 4–8. The evidence is now summarized in R. Stroud, \(The Axones and Kyrbeis of Drakon and Solon,\) Berkeley 1979, pp. 13–18.
sat the law court of the Archon Basileus\textsuperscript{71} and occasionally the Council of the Areopagus.\textsuperscript{72} The Stoa is also known to have served as a dining hall, though probably not regularly, and Pindar, in reference to meals subsidized by the state, relates Themis to Zeus Xenios.\textsuperscript{73} And Themis was the wife of Zeus,\textsuperscript{74} to whom was dedicated the Stoa beside the Royal Stoa, his statue standing in front of it.\textsuperscript{75} But the identification of torso S 2370 with Themis, no matter how relevant to the Royal Stoa, remains hypothetical, primarily because its association with the Stoa is by no means established.

If we suppose for a moment that S 2370 came from a near-by site, a third possibility presents itself. A suitable, recorded statue of the period that stood outdoors is that of Demokratia; a fragment of its base, dedicated by the Boule of 333/2 B.C., was recognized by Raubitschek (Pl. 36:f).\textsuperscript{76} Torso S 2370 belongs to the same general type as the figure holding a wreath, identified as Demokratia, on the relief of the anti-tyranny decree of 337/6 B.C., Athenian Agora I 6524 (Pl. 36:c): she probably reflects an older model, though not necessarily Euphranor’s painting of Theseus, Demokratia and Demos in the Stoa of Zeus.\textsuperscript{77} The cult of Demokratia in Athens is first attested by the sacrifices of the strategoi in 332/1 and 331/0 B.C., in the month of Boedromion, before the 17th and quite possibly on the 12th, on the anniversary of the restoration of democracy in 403 B.C.\textsuperscript{78} An ephic inscription of 214/3 B.C., mentioning the statue of Demokratia in connection with the ephebes’ activities,

\textsuperscript{71} Plato, \textit{Euthyphro}, 2a; \textit{Theatetos}, 210d.

\textsuperscript{72} Pseudo-Demosthenes, xxv.23.


\textsuperscript{74} Hesiod, \textit{Theogony}, 901–906; Pindar, \textit{Olympian} 8.2.

\textsuperscript{75} Pausanias, 1.3.2. Zeus and Themis were the parents of Eirene, who had a statue by Kephisodotos the Elder near the Eponymoi (Pausanias, 1.8.2) and another of unknown date outside the Prytaneion (Pausanias, 1.18.3).

\textsuperscript{76} A. E. Raubitschek, “Demokratia,” \textit{Hesperia} 31, 1962, pp. 238–243, pl. 86; \textit{idem}, “Demokratia,” \textit{Aktent des IV. Intern. Kongress für griech. und latein. Epigraphik}, Vienna 1964, pp. 332–337. See also P. J. Rhodes, \textit{The Athenian Boule}, Oxford 1972, p. 133; \textit{Agora XIV}, p. 159, note 219. The inscription on the statue base, now lost, was published by Boeckh in \textit{CIG} I, 95, republished, incomplete, in \textit{IG II}, 2791 and \textit{CIA II}, 1156. The fragment E.M. 3913 (Pl. 36:f) was associated by Raubitschek (\textit{Hesperia} 31, 1962, p. 242, pl. 86:d). It is the right-hand part of a block of a base of Eleusinian stone; the base must have consisted of more than one block. The top and right side, partly preserved, are smooth. There is no room between the top and the final A of \textit{Demokratia} for another line; therefore the letters I...\textit{BAΣ} must belong to a separate inscription and were correctly omitted from \textit{IG II}, 2791. The restored inscription should thus read (\textit{non-ΣTOIK: Demokratia is in larger letters than the rest}): \[\Delta \eta \mu \omicron \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \mid \int \iota \alpha\]

\textsuperscript{77} The statue base was built in the now demolished church of St. Nicolas in the area north of the Royal Stoa. For the church see A. Mommsen, \textit{Athenae Christianae}, Leipzig 1868, p. 106, no. 126; J. Travlos, \textit{Πολιοδομική έκδηλείς τῶν Ἀθηνῶν}, Athens 1960, pl. 12, no. 93.

\textsuperscript{78} Euphranor’s painting of the 360’s was too early for this high-girt type, cf. Palagia, \textit{Euphranor}, pp. 60–61. For the iconography of Demokratia see Raubitschek, \textit{op. cit.} (footnote 76 above), pp. 238–239; Hamdorf, p. 112; Palagia, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 57–61.

has recently turned up in the neighborhood of the Royal Stoa. The Demokratia also occurs in one other ephetic inscription, IG II², 1011 of 106/5 B.C., one copy of which was to be set up by the statue. Raubitschek attempted to locate this cult near the 3rd-century shrine of Demos and the Graces at the north foot of Kolonos Agoraioi, on the basis of the joint inscription of the priest of Demokratia (Pl. 36:e), the priest of Demos and the Graces, and the priest of Ptolemy III Euergetes and Berenike, on two adjacent marble seats and their alleged backs from the theater of Dionysos in Athens. Joint citations on stone, however, do not entail a physical proximity of the different cults, and there is no other evidence connecting Demokratia with Kolonos Agoraioi.

From an inscription of 306/5–301 B.C. we hear of the decision of the picked volunteer troops to set up an equestrian statue of King Demetrios by the statue of Demokratia in the Agora. The statue of Demetrios has been identified in the fragments of a gilt bronze horseman from a deposit dating to the late 3rd or early 2nd century B.C. found in a public well just across the street from the Royal Stoa. It was no doubt dismantled ca. 201 B.C., victim to the damnatio memoriae that befell the Antigonids, recorded in Livy, xxxi. 44.4–8. The foundations of its pedestal, if not lurking in the unexplored part of the Agora, may have followed its fate: the damnatio seems to have extended to the sites of proscribed monuments. At any rate, the occurrence of the bronze fragments in the original destruction deposit in the immediate vicinity of the Royal Stoa may indicate that the statue of Demetrios, along with the Demokratia, stood close by, at the northwestern side of the Agora. The assignment of the Demokratia to the conglomerate base outside the Royal Stoa is rendered unlikely by the lack of traces of a cult (e.g. an altar). The fact, however, that both the Demetrios decree and IG II², 1011 specify the site for the erection of statue and stele as being next

79 Athenian Agora I 7484, S. V. Tracy, “Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora,” Hesperia 48, 1979, pp. 174–178, no. 1, line 18, pl. 59. Tracy seems to think that the Demokratia stood on the island of Salamis.

80 Agora III, no. 248, line 62. For the findspot (Panagia Pyrgiotissa) see Travlos, op. cit. (footnote 76 above), pl. 12, no. 117; Thompson, Guide, p. 135.


83 T. L. Shear, Jr., Hesperia 42, 1973, pp. 165–166, pl. 36:b, d; to be published by Caroline Houser, who associates the bronze fragments with the statue mentioned in the decree of Demetrios’ troops.

to the Demokratia need not imply that she stood far from any earlier public building of importance. A case in point is the decree honoring Euagoras of Salamis in 393 B.C.: providing for the erection of the stele, it seems to mention the statue of Zeus Eleutherios rather than the Stoa behind it as a point of reference.\textsuperscript{85} Compare also Isokrates on the statues of Konon and Euagoras outside the Stoa of Zeus (ix.57), \textit{"καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτῶν ἔστησαμεν ὑπὲρ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἄγαλμα τοῦ σωτῆρος."}\textsuperscript{86}

In the event of representing Demokratia, i.e. a civic as opposed to a military deity, S 2370 may have held a scepter rather than a spear in the left hand\textsuperscript{86} and a phiale in the right, or possibly a wreath, on the analogy of Agora I 6524 (Pl. 36:c). But the iconography of Demokratia being otherwise unknown, we have no means by which to ascertain the association of S 2370 with the statue of Demokratia: it remains an attractive hypothesis.

\begin{flushright}
\textsc{Olga Palagia}
\end{flushright}

\textsc{University of Athens}  
Department of Archaeology  
26-28 Asklipiou St.  
Athens 144, Greece


\textsuperscript{86} Cf. footnote 5 above.
PLATE 29

OLGA PALAGIA: A COLOSSAL STATUE OF A PERSONIFICATION

Athenian Agora S 2370

a. Front
b. Left side
c. Back
d. Right front
Plate 30

a. Folds between breasts

b. Folds at girdle

c. Left arm and shoulder

d. Left arm: socket

e. Right back

Athenian Agora S 2370

Olga Palagia: A Colossal Statue of a Personification
a. Restored drawing of the Stoa Basileios

b. S 2370 as found in the foundations of a Byzantine house

c. Athens N.M. 1335. Votive relief
a. Agathe Tyche. Vatican, Braccio Nuovo 59
b. Agathe Tyche. Vatican, Braccio Nuovo 86
d. Girl. Athens N.M. 693
e. Girl. Athens N.M. 694
f. Athenian Agora S 378


Olga Palagia: A Colossal Statue of a Personification
a. Child. Athens N.M. 696

b. Athens N.M. 1476

c. Leptis Tyche. Tripolis Museum

d, e. Rhamnous Themis. Athens N.M. 231

OLGA PALAGIA: A COLOSSAL STATUE OF A PERSONIFICATION
a. Hygieia relief. Athens N.M. 1330

b. Terme 11618

c. Hygieia relief. Louvre 755

Olga Palagia: A Colossal Statue of a Personification
a. Relief. Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek cat. no. 227a

b. Athens N.M. 3917

c. Athens N.M. 2958

d. Ashmolean Museum 59.6  

c. Athens N.M. 2012

OLGA PALAGIA: A COLOSSAL STATUE OF A PERSONIFICATION
OLGA PALAGIA: A COLOSSAL STATUE OF A PERSONIFICATION