Newly Acquired Bronzes—Greek, Etruscan, and Roman

by DIETRICH VON BOTHMER  Curator

In the last few years the Museum has increased its collection of ancient bronzes with a number of notable acquisitions. Many of them will be exhibited in the Recent Accessions Room beginning January 17, where the visitor can follow the development of metalwork through eight centuries of ancient art.

Among the earliest bronzes is the forepart, or protome, of a griffin (Figure 1) which had come up at auction in Paris in 1959. The previous owner, Professor C. Mège, had recorded it as having been found in Olympia. Such griffins were attached to the shoulders of big bronze bowls which stood on tripods and were among

Fig. 1. Protome of a griffin. Greek, second half of VII century B.C. Fletcher Fund, 1959

Heights for this and the following pieces are given in the notes.
the favorite offerings in the great Greek sanctuaries at Olympia, Delphi, on Samos, Rhodes, and elsewhere. Much work has been done of late both on the types and on the origins of the griffin protomai, and the discussion is by no means concluded. New articles on these griffins appear constantly, but the best collection of them is to be found in a recent monograph by Professor U. Jantzen.\textsuperscript{2} The New York griffin belongs to his Fifth Group of cast protomai. Here the spirals on the neck, a feature of the earlier griffins, have been given up, but the neck still tapers as in the earlier groups. The eyes were originally worked in another material and were inlaid: they are now invariably missing.

The New York griffin is well preserved, save for the edges of the ears which are frayed and some small holes in the neck and in the head.

The neck terminates in a turned-up flange on which five rivets still exist that held the protome in place on the shoulder of the hammered bowl. Cleaning has brought out the feathers on the head and on the neck which are indicated by short incised or punched hooks. The plumage does not reach all the way down to the flange, but stops about an inch short of it, since at this place the griffin changes from one species of animal to another, from bird to mammal, with the feathers of the eagle giving way to the pelt of the lion.

Of the two hundred bronze griffins known, only two have been found in an archaeological context that permits absolute dates. Fortunately the two which can be dated mark the beginning and the end of the series and stand about a hundred and twenty-five years apart. Jantzen's
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\caption{Channel, probably part of a tripod leg. Greek, about 660 B.C. Huntley Bequest, 1958}
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\caption{Decoration on the flange of the channel above}
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plausible arrangement of the entire series within this span is based on relative chronology and yields a date in the second half of the seventh century B.C. for the New York griffin.

Likewise of the seventh century B.C., and probably even earlier than the griffin, is an elaborate bronze structure for which at present there is no published parallel. The base of it is a bronze channel (Figures 2-4), more than thirty-five inches in length, and presumably preserved in its entirety, though broken in three parts. There is a pronounced taper to this channel which measures $\frac{51}{6}$ inches across at one extremity and $4\frac{3}{4}$ at the other. Two series of holes for rivets and nails are grouped in pairs along the edges on the top or front side of the channel. Some of the rivets are still in place, but the nails which were perhaps of iron have all been lost. The channel was faced or covered with a long strip of bronze which bore engraved decoration set in panels. Of these panels two that join are still preserved, and their position on the channel (Figure 4) can be determined by the correspondence of the rivets and the rivet holes on the channel and the plaques. Both panels come from the lower part of the channel: the distribution of the rivet holes suggests that there were three more above. The bronze strip from which the panels or plaques are broken likewise tapered. It was wider than the channel to which it was fastened, with the overhang distributed unevenly between the two sides. The edges of the facing strip are rolled over iron rods which are now completely oxidized. The two preserved panels are divided one from the other by transverse ridges and horizontal ornamental bands.

The special interest of the bronze lies in the engraved scenes of the panels (Figure 6). Both are mythological in subject. The upper of the two shows on the left a group of four women arranged in two pairs, while a fifth woman on the right is held back by a man. The fifth woman and her suitor are somewhat bigger in scale, and these two should be the principal persons. The arrangement of the other four women suggests a formation, such as a dance, with two of the women looking around to see what is happening.

---

*Fig. 4. The channel before and after attachment of the remaining engraved panels*
behind them. The two groups are also linked by the gestures which register surprise. Evidently it is one of their group who has been seized by the man. There are many episodes in Greek mythology that tell of abductions, and in the absence of inscribed names or distinctive dress and armor we must seek our clues from the scene itself, its mood and composition. Here we are guided by the plurality of the women on the left and by the general resemblance they bear to one another and to the woman on the right. This abduction therefore points to an event where one of a large number was singled out and seized. Fortunately we have a related scene on a Corinthian column-krater in the Louvre. There seven girls are shown in a dance, and some of them look around at a man who lies in ambush behind them. His name is inscribed, and we learn that he is Peleus. Hence the dancing girls must be the Nereids of whom one, Thetis, was destined to become his bride. I take it that the scene on the bronze panel is from the same story but represents a later moment: Peleus has risen from his ambush and has boldly seized Thetis, while her sisters and companions in the dance look on helplessly. We are ill-informed about the exact sequence of events and have contradictory versions of the reasons for which Peleus was chosen by the gods to be the husband of Thetis. But we do know, both from literature and from representations in art, that Thetis put up a struggle and changed shapes, becoming in turn a lion, a snake, fire, and water. In the end, Peleus won, and his wedding to Thetis was honored by the participation of the gods from Olympus. The sequel to this celebration is well-known: Eris, goddess of strife, was not invited and tossed an apple among the assembled guests, inscribed “To the Most Beautiful”; the judgment of Paris followed, and as a consequence the Trojan War broke out in which Achilles, the only child of Peleus and Thetis, lost his life.

While it is difficult to be completely certain about the subject on this bronze panel, it must be said that no other interpretation has been advanced and that the title “Peleus and Thetis” has not met with objections. The scene on the lower panel, on the other hand, is perfectly clear and can be readily identified. Here the monster Chimaera is about to be killed by Bellerophon who rides the winged horse, Pegasus. The composition called for an oblong rather than a square, and the artist changed the proportions by adding a decorative band of tongues below the ridge, which brought the height of the picture down. The chimaera is shown in the traditional form of a lion with a tail terminating in a snake, while the forepart of a goat grows out of its back. Hesiod was the first among the ancient writers to call the monster “fire-breathing,” and on this engraved bronze flames seem to issue from the open mouth of the goat. The monster has felled a stag which lies on its back, the legs stretched out stiffly. Pegasus is aloft and looks very small next to the chimaera. The winged horse is bridled; Bellerophon holds the reins in one hand and poises a javelin in the other. As often in Greek art the decisive phase of a combat or hunt which is shown is not that of the actual killing of the enemy or prey, but the moment immediately before: both combatants are shown.

Fig. 5. Chimaera, detail (actual size) of the lower panel of Figure 6
Fig. 6. The two plaques attached to the channel
Huntley Bequest, 1958 and 1959
at the height of their strength and power, and as the ending of the story is already known to the spectator, the outcome of the struggle cannot be in doubt. There are several other representations of Bellerophon and the chimaera in early Greek art, mostly on a smaller scale. All exhibit a certain uniformity of composition, with the chimaera always on the left, Pegasus usually aloft and bridled, and with Bellerophon as a bearded hunter who wields the javelin. The picture on the bronze panel departs in only one significant detail from the others already known: it adds a victim of the chimaera, the stag, and builds up the three figures to a towering triangle. At the same time, the space is admirably filled—in ancient art empty patches are assiduously avoided—and the monstrous additions which transform a lion into a chimaera help to balance the wings of the horse and its rider.

Engraved pictures on archaic bronzes are relatively rare, whereas scenes rendered in relief are quite common. Yet the two techniques of bronze decoration exist side by side, and both reach their finest flowering on the hinged Greek mirrors of the fourth century, where the covers are normally decorated with reliefs on the outside, while the inside often bears splendid engraved designs. The technique of engraving bronzes was also practiced by the Etruscans, whose engraved
mirrors and *cistae* include many masterpieces of design. The earliest engravings on Greek bronzes occur on Boeotian fibulae of the geometric age, which begin to show mythological subjects, but the other examples are more isolated: bronze cuirasses from Olympia, other pieces of armor (notably a series of helmets), a few mirror handles, and the like. Two engraved plaques, still unpublished, have recently been found in Olympia. In most of these early examples some of the contours are rendered with double lines, whereas single lines are used for inner markings and other details. On the two plaques in New York the double contour is employed throughout save for the human heads and hands, and the foreheads of Pegasus and the fallen stag. Stippling is used for the body of the winged horse, the skin of the stag, and in the chimaera for the lion and goat parts (see Figure 5). On the other panel it is also employed for some of the decorative patterns on the peploi, and for the short chiton of Peleus. Short hooked lines render the scales of the snake part of Chimaera, and lightly hatched lines give

*Fig. 9. Dinos. Greek (from Attica), 5th century B.C.*

The Cleveland Museum of Art, John Huntington Collection, 1928
such details as the crest of her mane, and the reins and bridle of Pegasus. What look at first glance like bracelets on the wrists of Bellerophon, Peleus, Thetis, and her sisters, are probably merely anatomical markings of the wrist and should not be considered ornaments. The double lines around the neck of Thetis and some of her companions, on the other hand, may well stand for necklaces. In the photographs here reproduced, the engraved lines have been filled with white water color, to bring out the design: in antiquity the effect must have been the opposite, when the flat surfaces were brilliantly polished and light, while the engraved lines remained matte and dark.

The same variety of engraved lines also exists in the ornamental bands which are framed by the horizontal ridges. Of the two which are preserved, the more elaborate appears above the panel of Thetis and Peleus. Here four palmettes alternate with four open lotuses, all upright. The ornament on the other panel is a cable pattern. These ornamental strips are not only framed by the raised ridges, but also completely surrounded by rows of hatched lines and small punched circles. The punched circles also frame each picture on all four sides. The flanges of the channel are likewise decorated (Figure 3): here palmettes of a different species alternate with lotus buds, with the palmettes pointing away from the decorated facing and the lotuses pointing toward it.

The provenance of the bronzes is not known, but the style, and even the patina of the bronze, suggest the Greek mainland, possibly the Peloponese, as their country of origin. Two questions are raised at once: what was the use of the object, and how is it to be dated? Of these, the second can be answered more readily, since the rich decoration of the plaques allows us to compare them, both for their composition and for every detail, with painted vases the chronology of which is established. The ornaments and the figure style are characteristic of the seventh century B.C., the period when the narrative style triumphed over the more rigid groupings of the geometric age, and when the Greeks opened themselves to influences from the East, not only taking over many of the floral ornaments, but
also increasing their stock of monsters and paying more attention to lions and panthers. For a more narrow date within the seventh century B.C. we can profitably compare the Bellerophon plaque with Protocorinthian vases of the same subject, vases which furnish a chronology which has been worked out to everybody’s satisfaction. Here a tiny aryballos in Boston\(^8\) is particularly close to the engraved scene. The Boston vase is generally dated about 660 B.C.,\(^9\) and the same general date may be accepted for the bronze in New York.

Now for the purpose the long bronze channel with its engraving served, we first note that it is wider on top than on the bottom, and that its height is about that of a table leg. Of the holes on the channel, one series is explained by the rivets for the bronze facing; the other must have served for the attachment of the channel to a wooden leg. As the bronze facing is wider than the channel to which it was attached, and as the flanges of the channel are decorated, it may be assumed that the structure was freestanding and was meant to be seen from the front and from the sides, like the leg of a tripod. Tripod legs have indeed been found in Olympia which are similar in cross section, though somewhat simpler in design, being cast in one piece. The direction of the taper rules out a comparison with a relief plaque from Olympia\(^{10}\) but agrees with one from the Argive Heraeum.\(^{11}\)

The next two bronzes are less tantalizing, since they are remarkably complete and easy to understand. Both are vases, a psykter\(^{12}\) (Figures 7, 8) and an amphora\(^{13}\) (Figures 10-12), and they are said to have been found together in northern Greece. The amphora is of a rare type, and the psykter is, as far as I can see, unique. “Psykter” means cooler, and the shape is known from Attic terracotta vases. Painted scenes on Attic vases also tell us how the psykter was used.\(^{14}\) Normally wine was drunk mixed with water in varying proportions. The wine was either mixed in a big vessel, a krater, or it was mixed in the cup. Often the unmixed wine had to be cooled, and on such occasions it was poured

*Fig. 12 (left). Handle with the head of a gorgon, detail from the other side of amphora above*

*Fig. 13 (right). Handle with the head of a gorgon. Greek (said to be from Macedonia), IV century B.C. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, H. L. Pierce Fund*
Fig. 14 (opposite). Handles from a louteron. Greek, first quarter of 5th century B.C.
Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1959

Fig. 15. Three satyrs, details of Figure 14

into a so-called psykter, a vase shaped like the newly acquired bronze, and placed in a krater which was filled with snow or ice-cold water. It will be observed how the special curve of the psykter served two purposes: it afforded the maximum cooling surface, and it allowed the psykter to float in the cold water of the krater, emerging almost completely as it got empty.

About eighty Attic terracotta psykters have been preserved, either completely or in parts, and the shape in terracotta has been studied in detail. Two chief divisions have been observed: a psykter which was meant to have a lid and always has rudimentary handles or tubes through which a cord could pass, and a type which has neither handles nor lid. The bronze psykter in New York (Figure 7) agrees in its profile with the Attic shape known in terracotta but instead of mere tubes for the attachment of strings or

Fig. 16. Foot (one of three) in the shape of a lion paw, from the same vase as the handles in Figure 14
leather cords, it is furnished with two swinging handles. The body of the vase is raised from a single disk of sheet bronze. The rim is cast and soldered on to the top. The lid is made in two pieces: the rim, bent at right angles to form a flange which fits the inside of the mouth, and a domed centerpiece which is soldered to the rim. The handles are hammered out of heavy rectangular bronze wire, and their terminal buds are shaped by hammering and filing. The handle-attachments are decorated with palmettes and volutes. Both are shaped from sheet bronze by cutting, hammering, and filing. The lower part of each attachment was bent to conform to the curve of the shoulder to which it was soldered, while the upper part, the rings of the volute, stands upright. The swinging handles must have been slipped into the rings of the attachment before the latter was soldered to the vase. The base of the psykter is profiled, but was not cast separately. It is part of the raised body, and the decorative circles on it are chased. The illustrations show the psykter in two different positions: with the handles raised for carrying, and with the handles lowered while the vase stood on the ground or floated in the krater.

Wine coolers of this particular shape do not begin in terracotta before the introduction of Attic red-figure, about 525 B.C., and seem to have gone out of fashion about 460 B.C. Yet the word psykter is still employed in Greek literature and in inscriptions much later and must apply to other shapes which served the same purpose. Pollux defines the shape as a dinos without foot which rested on knucklebones, and the Cleveland Museum owns such a vase of bronze (Figure 9) which may have been called a psykter in antiquity. Others have tried to interpret as psykters the bucket-shaped vases with swinging handles that are more commonly called situlae. Both the dinos in Cleveland and the bronze situlae share with the newly acquired psykter of New York the swinging handles and perhaps all three shapes served the same function.

The New York bronze psykter holds one quart and twenty-nine ounces; the amphora (Figure 11) that is said to have been found with it is considerably larger and has a capacity of fifteen quarts and fifteen ounces. As in the psykter the body of the vase is raised from a single disk of sheet bronze, but the foot, the handles, the rim, and the swinging handle, or bail, are cast. The amphora, too, has a lid which is hammered and secured to the bail by a chain (Figure 10). The foot is soldered on, but the vertical handles were riveted to the rim and the shoulder of the amphora after the swinging handle had been slipped through the rings on top of the vertical handles. The bail has a ring attached to it on top, and two knobby rings along its arch. The ring on top must have served to fasten a rope when the amphora was lowered into a well, and the ring-joints along its arch may have secured a firmer grip on the handle when the vase was carried. Two stops arranged in opposite directions on the rings of the vertical handles keep the bail from swinging all the way around and bashing into the thin wall of the neck.

The chief beauty of the amphora, however, lies in its sculptural decoration. Below each of the vertical handles, but in one piece with it, spreads the head of a gorgon in high relief (Figure 12), her mouth opened in the fierce grin of
th the monster, with a furry tongue sticking out between the two rows of teeth. Her abundant hair is parted in the middle and falls down on each side of the face behind the ears. A series of short curls seems to grow from the line of the jaw, and two half-coiled snakes appear on the top of her head. Gorgons and snakes are very much at home at the roots of bronze handles: they are known in this location from hydriai and oinochoai, and appear even more dominantly on the handles of volute-kraters, but they go out of fashion in the fifth century when their place is taken by the more benevolent sirens.

There are very few bronze amphorae that can be likened to the one in New York. One, very similar in shape and construction, has been found in Gela, in Sicily, and is now in the museum in Syracuse.19 Here the vertical handles terminate below in palmettes, and the chain on the lid is attached to the collar of a dog: in every other respect the two amphorae are very much alike, and one would say both were made in the same workshop. Greek bronze amphorae of a simpler type, without the bail, have been found in Paestum and in Trebenishte.20 For the bail amphora we have incomplete examples in Leningrad and Boston. The parallel in Boston21 consists of two vertical handles only, complete with rings on top and stops attached to them. At the base of each handle is the head of a gorgon with two snakes above (Figure 19). Here the mouth of the gorgon is closed, and if it were not for the snakes one would have difficulty recognizing her as a fierce monster. The example in Leningrad comes from South Russia22 and consists of the two vertical handles, a part of the neck and the bail. Here the gorgon heads have been replaced by sirens. The system of stops on the rings for a single swinging handle, finally, is transmitted to Etruria, where it occurs on bronze situlae of which Boston owns one of the best examples.23

The bronze psykter has been cleaned by the Museum, but the appearance of the surface of the psykter was very similar to that of the amphora, and there is no reason to doubt that the two vases were found together. The shape and the ornament, and certainly the sculptural decoration, are archaic in character. I hesitate to apply too precise a date to the two bronze vases;

Fig. 18. Handle from an oinochoe. Etruscan, early VI century B.C. Rogers Fund, 1960
there are no parallels in bronze for the psykter, and only one that is close for the amphora. A balanced evaluation of all possible criteria yields a date at the end of the sixth century B.C., but allowance must be made for a certain conservatism, and it is possible that both vases belong to the beginning of the fifth. It has often been asserted that terracotta vases imitate metal vases: in the case of the psykter we have perhaps the reverse, a metal vase which imitates a shape first created and developed on the potter's wheel.

Metal vases are not nearly so well-known as terracotta vases, because they must always have been rarer and have not survived in any great number. The hammered portions of a metal vase are usually fairly thin and have corroded to the point of complete disappearance. Its cast elements are thicker and thus stand a better chance of survival. Handles and feet are therefore more numerous than complete vases, but we are often hampered in our appreciation and understanding by the absence of the hammered bodies, and the variety of shapes that must have existed in antiquity is not nearly so well attested in metal as in terracotta. The Museum has recently acquired two bronze handles and three bronze feet of yet another bronze vase for which there are no published parallels.24 The three feet (see Figure 16) are in the shape of lion paws which terminate above in volutes and half-palmettes. Together they must have supported a ring base the diameter of which can be calculated from the preserved arcs of the circumference. Such ring bases with lion feet are the normal support for big bowls which served as podanipers, foot baths.25 In the newly acquired lot, however, they go with two vertical handles which cannot have come from this shape. The handles (Figure 14) are in the shape of an ornately formed letter M and display in their lower parts evidence of having been attached to a double curve, such as the shoulders of a bowl which curved in on top. The lower central finial of each handle is formed by a palmette. This is followed by a short sleeve from which spring two curved branches and a central flower bud. The branches, in turn, terminate in delicately modeled figures of reclining satyrs. One of the four satyrs is unfortunately missing, but the three who remain rest on their elbows and on one leg (Figure 15). The off leg is bent at the knee and pulled back. One hand of each satyr holds a drinking horn, the other is placed on the thigh of the bent leg. They have horses' hooves and ears, and are snub-
nosed. Of the three satyrs, no two are alike; each differs from his companions in the attitude of the body and the expression of the face. If today they look somewhat uncomfortable, it must be remembered that their posture was a normal one for banquets, and would have looked quite natural on the round shoulders of a vase. As we search for parallels among bronzes, we find none, but on terracotta vases the shape of handles is known from the so-called nuptial lebetes, bowls with or without stands which had double-looped vertical handles. They were modeled after louteria, washbasins, and were among the vases employed in Attica at weddings. Most nuptial basins are quite small, but a fragmentary terracotta louterion has been found in the Athenian Agora which bears a closer resemblance to the shape which we should postulate for the bronze vase. Nothing is known about the circumstances of the bronze find, but the shape of the palmette and even more strongly the modeling of the satyrs suggest a date in the first quarter of the fifth century B.C.

The last Greek bronze is a small openwork
relief of a seated Eros\textsuperscript{28} (Figure 17). The relief is squarish and has a tang below, for insertion in a wooden handle. The top side is curved, and the relief belongs to a series of mirror-attachments common in the Greek colonies of Southern Italy and Sicily, but not before represented in the Museum's collection. The disk of the mirror proper was attached to the top of the relief with solder. The type has been well studied by Jantzen\textsuperscript{29} who localizes the workshop in Locri. It can be dated in the fourth century B.C.

With this piece from Southern Italy we turn to the western Mediterranean. Bronze was a favorite metal in Etruria, and many of the finest bronzes were made there. Some of them were even exported to Greece proper.\textsuperscript{30} Earliest among the Etruscan bronzes shown in the Recent Accessions Room is the cast handle of an oinochoe\textsuperscript{31} (Figure 18). The head of a lion is turned toward the mouth of the vase, while two snakes lie to either side of it, following the contours of the mouth of the vase. The lower end of the handle is in the form of a female head between two snakes. Here, as so often in Etruscan art, the conventions are thoroughly Greek, but the execution is just a little coarser and looks earlier than it is. If this handle were Greek, the female head might still be called Dedalic, and the ob-

---

Fig. 22. Head of a satyr, handle-attachment of a situla. Roman, first half of 1 century A.D.
Gift of Florence H. de Schlubach, 1958
Parts of such tripods have been found in Greece and in the Greek territory of Southern Italy, but it is in Etruria that the rod-tripod reached its fullest development. The feet (Figure 21) are in the shape of lion paws resting on frogs. The arches (Figure 19) are filled with acorns and palmettes, and surmounted by lions killing a bull and a ram and a panther felling a deer. Each of the three rods is topped by a group of two figures (Figure 20). In one group we recognize Herakles and a woman (perhaps Athena); in another we have two youths with boots, perhaps the Dioskouroi; while two satyrs form the third group. The principle of decoration is rather constant in these tripods, but they vary greatly in execution and in the detail of both figures and patternwork.

The New York tripod is particularly close to a series put together by Neugebauer and can be dated in the late sixth century B.C.

Lastly two Roman bronzes. One of them, not shown in the Recent Accessions Room, but upstairs in the bronze gallery, had been on loan to the Museum for some time before it was given by the lender, Florence H. de Schlubach. It is the handle-attachment of a bronze situla, or bucket, and shows in very high relief the head of a satyr (Figure 22). There is much admirable detail in the bronze which only cleaning has revealed. When the attachment first came to the Museum it was for the most part covered with sea shells, and the donor informs us that the object was found in the sea off the coast of Majorca. The swinging handles of the situla passed through the massive ring above the head. A semicircular protrusion below the ring is decorated with a swastika meander which is inlaid with silver. A tainia, or fillet on the forehead of the satyr, is likewise a silver inlay, and the lips appear to be of copper. Handle-attachments of this monumental size are not very common, but the New York public has on several occasions seen another one, quite close to the Museum’s recent acquisition: the bronze satyr often lent by Walter C. Baker and shown again recently in the exhibition of his drawings. Others are in Vienna, in the Stuttgart market, in Ostia, and in the museum on Delos, and while the style is always the same, all differ from one another in scale and in details, and no two of them form a pair. One of the group has been found with coins of the

ject dated in the late seventh century B.C.: in Etruria the style lasted longer, and a date early in the sixth century is more appropriate. Similar handles are to be seen in the museum of the Villa Giulia in Rome.

An Etruscan rod-tripod (Figures 19-21) is more ambitious. Unfortunately it is not complete and would be somewhat difficult to reconstruct, so that for the present its component parts have to be shown separately. Three arches alternate with three rods and their ends join in three feet, held together by a spider. On top the arches and the rods were attached to a ring-band, and the whole served as a support for a bowl.
Emperor Claudius, and the entire group can therefore be dated in the first half of the first century A.D.

The last bronze (Figure 23) is more of a riddle. It is said to have been found in Anatolia and represents in very high relief the bust of a woman, possibly an Amazon or a goddess. The back is hollow and shows signs of an attachment to an iron rod or shaft, and several holes in the flatter parts of the relief must be rivet holes. The figure wears an Eastern headdress, sometimes called the Phrygian cap, of which the two side lappets are tied on top. With her right arm she seems to lean on a shaft or tree trunk, while the left hand rests on the right upper arm. A sheathed sword is carried horizontally directly below the left elbow. Of her two garments the lower one shows a buttoned short sleeve. The buttons were once inlaid in silver and are now missing. Her right arm is truncated above the wrist, but this is not a break, but perhaps a fault in the casting. Among the published bronzes I have found only one which resembles the attachment in New York: it is in the British Museum (Figure 24) and was for years in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities until it was transferred, since no other parallel was known, to the Department of British and Mediaeval Antiquities. When the bronze in London was first published, it was still considered classical: with the arrival of a similar bronze in New York the whole question may have to be reopened, and perhaps the classical character of the bronze in New York may help to vindicate the first thoughts about the piece in London. In any event, speaking guardedly, and only for the bronze in New York, it may be stated to represent a classicizing style of the Roman Empire, perhaps of the early second century A.D.
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20 Two in Paestum, Bollittino d'Arte XL (1955), p. 62, figs. 20-21, heights, 19\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{2} in. and 14\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{8} in.; Filow Die archaische Nekropole von Trebenischte, pp. 57-60, no. 71, figs. 59-62, height, 17\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{8} in.; Popović Catalogue des Objets Découverts près de Trebenisté, pl. 33, no. 43, height 19\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{8} in.


22 Reinach Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmérien, pl. 44, 3.

23 01.228. Described in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Museum of Fine Arts (1892), pp. 11-12, no. 5.

24 Acc. No. 59.11.23. Height of handles, from 6\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{2} in. to 6\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{4} in.; height of feet, from 3\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{2} in. to 3\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{2} in. Estimated diameter of ring base, 10\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{2} in.


26 Cf. London B 298 (Richter and Milne Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases, fig. 72).

27 P 12641, to be published by Brian Shefton in Hesperia.

28 Acc. No. 58.11.3. Said to have been found near Troina in Sicily. Height 5\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{8} in.


31 Acc. No. 60.11.7. Said to be from Vulci. Height 5 in.

32 Acc. No. 60.11.11. Height of figures, 3 in.


34 Acc. No. 58.140. Height, 12 in. For a complete bibliography of such attachments and a discussion see my forthcoming catalogue Ancient Art from New York Private Collections, no. 101.

35 Acc. No. 59.11.16. Height, 5\textperthousand \textfrac{1}{2} in.

36 R. P. K. ix.1. Specimens of Antient Sculptures II, pl. 34.