

R E P O R T

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

THE EARL OF ELGIN'S COLLECTION

OF

SCULPTURED MARBLES,

&c.

# CONTENTS.

---

REPORT.....	Page 1—12
<i>Minutes of Evidence</i> .....	13
The Earl of ELGIN .....	13—20
The Right Honourable CHARLES LONG .....	21
WILLIAM HAMILTON, Esq.....	22—26
JOSEPH NOLLEKENS, Esq. R. A.....	27—28
JOHN FLAXMAN, Esq. R. A. ....	28—32
RICHARD WESTMACOTT, Esq. R. A. ....	32—33
FRANCIS CHANTERY, Esq. ....	33—34
CHARLES ROSSI, Esq. R. A.....	34—35
Sir THOMAS LAWRENCE, Knt. R. A. ....	35—36
RICHARD PAYNE KNIGHT, Esq. ....	36—41
WILLIAM WILKINS, Esq. ....	41—45
TAYLOR COMBE, Esq. ....	45—46
The Earl of ABERDEEN .....	46—50
JOHN BACON SAWREY MORRITT, Esq.....	50—52
JOHN NICHOLAS FAZAKENLEY, Esq. ....	52—53
ALEXANDER DAY, Esq.....	53—54
Rev. Dr. PHILIP HUNT, LL. D. ....	55—58
Questions sent to BENJAMIN WEST, Esq., with the Answers.....	58—60

## APPENDIX.

No. 2.—Letter from Lord ELGIN to the Right Honourable N. VANSITTART, accompanying his Petition to the House of Commons .....	Page 61
No. 3.—Memorandum, as to Lord ELGIN's exclusive right of Property in the Collection of Marbles .....	<i>ib.</i>
No. 4.—Memorandum, as to the delay in transferring Lord ELGIN's Collection to the Public .....	62
No. 5.—Copy of a Letter addressed by Lord ELGIN to the Right Honourable Charles Long, in 1811; with a Postscript added February 1816, enumerating Expenses, &c.....	63—66
No. 6.—Letter from Lord ELGIN to HENRY BANKES, Esq. enumerating Expenses.....	66
No. 7.—Copy of a Letter from CHARLES TOWNLEY, Esq. to J. HARRISON, Esq. on the Subject of Lord ELGIN's Marbles.....	67
No. 8.—Translation of a Letter from the Cavalier CANOVA to the Earl of ELGIN .....	68
No. 9.—Extract of a Despatch from his Excellency the Earl of ELGIN to Lord HAWKESBURY, dated Constantinople ..	<i>ib.</i>
No. 10.—Translation of a Fermañ to the Vaivode, or Governor of Athens, in 1801 .....	<i>ib.</i>
Catalogue of the ELGIN Marbles, Vases, Casts, and Drawings, prepared from the MS. of M. VISCONTI .....	70—74

# R E P O R T.

---

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire, whether it be expedient that the Collection mentioned in the EARL of ELGIN'S Petition presented to the HOUSE on the 15th Day of February last, should be purchased on behalf of the Public; and, if so, what Price it may be reasonable to allow for the same,

CONSIDER the Subject referred to them, as divided into Four principal Heads; The First of which relates to the Authority by which this Collection was acquired: The Second to the circumstances under which that Authority was granted:

The Third to the Merit of the Marbles as works of Sculpture, and the importance of making them Public Property, for the purpose of promoting the study of the Fine Arts in Great Britain;—and

The Fourth to their Value as objects of Sale; which includes the consideration of the Expense which has attended the removing, transporting, and bringing them to England.

To these will be added some general Observations upon what is to be found, in various Authors, relating to these Marbles.

## I.

WHEN the Earl of *Elgin* quitted England upon his mission to the Ottoman Porte, it was his original intention to make that appointment beneficial to the progress of the Fine Arts in Great Britain, by procuring accurate drawings and casts of the valuable remains of Sculpture and Architecture, scattered throughout Greece, and particularly concentrated at Athens.

With this view he engaged Signor Lusieri, a painter of reputation, who was then in the service of the King of the Two Sicilies, together with two architects, two modellers, and a figure painter, whom Mr. *Hamilton* (now Under Secretary of State) engaged at Rome, and despatched with Lusieri, in the summer of 1800, from Constantinople to Athens.

They were employed there about nine months, from August 1800 to May 1801, without having any sort of facility or accommodation afforded to them: nor was the Acropolis accessible to them, even for the purpose of taking drawings, except by the payment of a large fee, which was exacted daily.

The other five artists were withdrawn from Athens in January 1803, but Lusieri has continued there ever since, excepting during the short period of our hostilities with the Ottoman Porte.

During the year 1800, Egypt was in the power of the French: and that sort of contempt and dislike which has always characterized the Turkish government and people in their behaviour towards every denomination of Christians, prevailed in full force.

The success of the British arms in Egypt, and the expected restitution of that province to the Porte, wrought a wonderful and instantaneous change in the disposition of all ranks and descriptions of people towards our Nation. Universal benevolence and good-will appeared to take place of suspicion and aversion. Nothing was refused which was asked; and Lord *Elgin*, availing himself of this favourable and unexpected alteration, obtained, in the summer of 1801, access to the Acropolis for general purposes, with permission to draw, model, and remove; to which was added, a special license to excavate in a particular place. Lord *Elgin* mentions in his evidence, that he was obliged to send from Athens to Constantinople for leave to remove a house: at the same time remarking, that, in point of fact, all permissions issuing from the Porte to any distant provinces, are little better than authorities to make the best bargain that can be made with the local magistracies. The applications upon this subject passed in verbal conversations; but the warrants or fermauns were granted in writing, addressed to the chief authorities resident at Athens, to whom they were delivered, and in whose hands they remained: so that your Committee had no opportunity of learning from Lord *Elgin* himself their exact tenor, or of ascertaining in what terms they noticed, or allowed the displacing, or carrying away of these Marbles. But Dr. *Hunt*, who accompanied Lord *Elgin* as chaplain to the embassy, has preserved, and has now in his possession, a translation of the second fermaun, which extended the powers of the first; but as he had it not with him in London, to produce before your Committee, he stated the substance, according to his recollection, which was, "That, in order to show their particular respect to the Ambassador of Great Britain, the august Ally of the Porte, with whom they were now and had long been in the strictest alliance, they gave to his Excellency and to his Secretary, and the Artists employed by him, the most extensive permission to view, draw, and model, the ancient Temples of the Idols, and the Sculptures upon them, and to make excavations, and to take away any stones that might appear interesting to them." He stated further, that no remonstrance was at any time made, nor any displeasure shown, by the Turkish government, either at Constantinople or at Athens, against the extensive interpretation which was put upon this fermaun; and although the work of taking down and removing was going on for months, and even years, and was conducted in the most public manner, numbers of native labourers, to the amount of some hundreds, being frequently employed, not the least obstruction was ever interposed, nor the smallest uneasiness shown, after the granting of this second fermaun. Among the Greek population and inhabitants of Athens it occasioned no sort of dissatisfaction: but, as Mr. *Hamilton*, an eye-witness, expresses it, so far from exciting any unpleasant sensation, the people seemed to feel it as the means of bring-

ing foreigners into their country, and of having money spent among them. The Turks showed a total indifference and apathy as to the preservation of these remains, except when in a fit of wanton destruction they sometimes carried their disregard so far as to do mischief by firing at them. The numerous travellers and admirers of the Arts committed greater waste, from a very different motive; for many of those who visited the Acropolis tempted the soldiers, and other people-about the fortress, to bring them down heads, legs, or arms, or whatever other pieces they could carry off.

A translation of the fermaun itself has since been forwarded by Dr. *Hunt*, which is printed in the Appendix.

## II.

UPON the Second Division, it must be premised, that antecedently to Lord *Elgin's* departure for Constantinople, he communicated his intentions of bringing home casts and drawings from Athens, for the benefit and advancement of the Fine Arts in this country, to Mr. *Pitt*, Lord *Grenville*, and Mr. *Dundas*, suggesting to them the propriety of considering it as a national object, fit to be undertaken, and carried into effect at the public expense; but that this recommendation was in no degree encouraged, either at that time or afterwards.

It is evident, from a letter of Lord *Elgin* to the Secretary of State, 13 January 1803, that he considered himself as having no sort of claim for his disbursements in the prosecution of these pursuits, though he stated, in the same despatch, the heavy expenses in which they had involved him, so as to make it extremely inconvenient for him to forego any of the usual allowances to which Ambassadors at other courts were entitled. It cannot, therefore, be doubted, that he looked upon himself in this respect as acting in a character entirely distinct from his official situation. But whether the Government from whom he obtained permission did, or could so consider him, is a question which can be solved only by conjecture and reasoning, in the absence and deficiency of all positive testimony. The Turkish ministers of that day are, in fact, the only persons in the world capable (if they are still alive) of deciding the doubt; and it is probable that even they, if it were possible to consult them, might be unable to form any very distinct discrimination as to the character in consideration of which they acceded to Lord *Elgin's* request. The occasion made them, beyond all precedent, propitious to whatever was desired in behalf of the English nation: they readily, therefore, complied with all that was asked by Lord *Elgin*. He was an Englishman of high rank; he was also Ambassador from our Court: they granted the same permission to no other individual: but then, as Lord *Elgin* observes, no other individual applied for it to the same extent, nor had indeed the same unlimited means for carrying such an undertaking into execution. The expression of one of the most intelligent and distinguished of the British travellers, who visited Athens about the same period—appears to your Committee to convey as correct a judgment as can be formed upon this question, which is incapable of being satisfactorily separated, and ~~must~~ be taken in the aggregate.

The Earl of *Aberdeen*, in answer to an inquiry, whether the authority and influence of a public situation was in his opinion necessary for accomplishing the removal of

these Marbles, answered, that he did not think a private individual could have accomplished the removal of the remains which Lord *Elgin* obtained: and Doctor *Hunt*, who had better opportunities of information upon this point than any other person who has been examined, gave it as his decided opinion, that “ a British subject not in the situation of Ambassador, could not have been able to obtain from the Turkish Government a *fermaan* of such extensive powers.”

It may not be unworthy of remark, that the only other piece of Sculpture which was ever removed from its place for the purpose of export, was taken by Mr. Choiseul Gouffier, when he was Ambassador from France to the Porte; but whether he did it by express permission, or in some less ostensible way, no means of ascertaining are within the reach of your Committee. It was undoubtedly at various times an object with the French Government to obtain possession of some of these valuable remains; and it is probable, according to the testimony of Lord *Aberdeen* and others, that at no great distance of time they might have been removed by that government from their original site; if they had not been taken away, and secured for this country, by Lord *Elgin*.

### III.

THE Third Part is involved in much less intricacy: and although in all matters of Taste there is room for great variety and latitude of opinion, there will be found upon this branch of the subject much more uniformity and agreement than could have been expected. The testimony of several of the most eminent Artists in this kingdom, who have been examined, rates these Marbles in the very first class of ancient art, some placing them a little above, and others but very little below, the Apollo Belvidere, the Laocoon, and the Torso of the Belvidere. They speak of them with admiration and enthusiasm; and notwithstanding the manifold injuries of time and weather, and those mutilations which they have sustained from the fortuitous, or designed injuries of neglect, or mischief, they consider them as among the finest models, and the most exquisite monuments of antiquity. The general current of this portion of the evidence makes no doubt of referring the date of these works to the original building of the Parthenon, and to the designs of Phidias, the dawn of every thing which adorned and ennobled Greece. With this estimation of the excellence of these works, it is natural to conclude that they are recommended by the same authorities as highly fit, and admirably adapted to form a school for study, to improve our national taste for the Fine Arts; and to diffuse a more perfect knowledge of them throughout this kingdom.

Much indeed may be reasonably hoped and expected, from the general observation, and admiration of such distinguished examples. The end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, enlightened by the discovery of several of the noblest remains of antiquity, produced in Italy an abundant harvest of the most eminent men, who made gigantic advances in the path of Art, as Painters, Sculptors, and Architects. Caught by the novelty, attracted by the beauty, and enamoured of the perfection of those newly disclosed treasures, they imbibed the genuine spirit of ancient excellence, and transfused it into their own compositions.

It is surprising to observe in the best of these Marbles in how great a degree the

close imitation of nature is combined with grandeur of Style, while the exact details of the former in no degree detract from the effect and predominance of the latter.

The two finest single figures of this Collection differ materially in this respect from the Apollo Belvidere, which may be selected as the highest and most sublime representation of ideal form, and beauty, which Sculpture has ever embodied, and turned into shape.

The evidence upon this part of the inquiry will be read with satisfaction and interest, both where it is immediately connected with these Marbles, and where it branches out into extraneous observations, but all of them relating to the study of the Antique. A reference is made by one of the witnesses to a sculptor, eminent throughout Europe for his works, who lately left this Metropolis highly gratified by the view of these treasures of that branch of Art, which he has cultivated with so much success. His own letter to the Earl of *Elgin* upon this subject is inserted in the Appendix.

In the judgment of Mr. *Payne Knight*, whose valuation will be referred to in a subsequent page, the first class is not assigned to the two principal statues of this Collection; but he rates the Metopes in the first class of works in High Relief, and knows of nothing so fine in that kind. He places also the Frize in the first class of Low Relief; and considering a general Museum of Art to be very desirable, he looks upon such an addition to our National Collection as likely to contribute to the improvement of the Arts, and to become a very valuable acquisition; for the importation of which Lord *Elgin* is entitled to the gratitude of his Country.

#### IV.

THE directions of the House in the order of reference imposes upon your Committee the task of forming and submitting an opinion upon the Fourth Head, which otherwise the scantiness of materials for fixing a pecuniary Value, and the unwillingness, or inability in those who are practically most conversant in Statuary to afford any lights upon this part of the subject, would have rather induced them to decline.

The produce of this Collection, if it should be brought to sale in separate lots, in the present depreciated state of almost every article, and more particularly of such as are of precarious and fanciful value, would probably be much inferior to what may be denominated its intrinsic value.

The mutilated state of all the larger Figures, the want either of heads or features, of limbs or surface, in most of the Metopes, and in a great proportion of the Compartments even of the larger Frize, render this Collection, if divided, but little adapted to serve for the decoration of private houses. It should therefore be considered as forming a Whole, and should unquestionably be kept entire as a School of Art, and a Study for the formation of Artists. The competitors in the market, if it should be offered for sale without separation, could not be numerous. Some of the Sovereigns of Europe, added to such of the great Galleries or national Institutions in various parts of the Continent as may possess funds at the disposal of their directors sufficient for such a purpose, would in all probability be the only purchasers.

It is not, however, reasonable, nor becoming the liberality of Parliament, to withhold upon this account, whatever, under all the circumstances, may be deemed a just and

adequate price; and more particularly in a case where Parliament is left to fix its own valuation, and no specific sum is demanded, or even suggested, by the Party who offers the Collection to the Public.

It is obvious that the money expended in the acquisition of any commodity is not necessarily the measure of its real value. The sum laid out in gaining possession of two articles of the same intrinsic worth, may, and often does, vary considerably. In making two excavations, for instance, of equal magnitude and labour, a broken Bust or some few Fragments may be discovered in the one, and a perfect Statue in the other. The first cost of the broken Bust and of the entire Statue would in that case be the same; but it cannot be said that the value is therefore equal. In the same manner, by the loss or detention of a Ship, a great charge may have been incurred, and the original outgoing excessively enhanced; but the value to the buyer will in no degree be affected by these extraneous accidents. Supposing, again, Artists to have been engaged at considerable salaries during a large period in which they could do little or nothing, the first cost would be burdensome in this case also to the employer; but those who bought would look only at the value of the article in the market where it might be exposed to sale, without caring, or inquiring how, or at what expense it was brought thither.

Supposing, on the other hand, that the thirteen other Metopes had been bought at the Custom House sale at the same price which that of Mr. Choiseul Gouffier fetched, it could never be said, that the value of them was no more than twenty-four or twenty-five pounds a piece.

It is perfectly just and reasonable that the seller should endeavour fully to reimburse himself for all expenses, and to acquire a profit also; but it will be impossible for him to do so, whenever the disbursements have exceeded the fair money price of that which he has to dispose of.

Your Committee refer to Lord *Elgin's* evidence for the large and heavy charges which have attended the formation of this Collection, and the placing of it in its present situation; which amount, from 1799 to January 1803, to £62,440, including £23,240 for the interest of money; and according to a supplemental account, continued from 1803 to 1816, to no less a sum than £74,000, including the same sum for interest.

All the papers which are in his possession upon this subject, including a journal of above 90 pages, of the daily expenses of his principal artist Lusieri, (from 1803 to the close of 1814,) who still remains in his employment at Athens, together with the account current of Messrs. Hayes of Malta, (from April 1807 to May 1811,) have been freely submitted to your Committee; and there can be no doubt, from the inspection of those accounts, confirmed also by other testimony, that the disbursements were very considerable; but supposing them to reach the full sum at which they are calculated, your Committee do not hesitate to express their opinion, that they afford no just criterion of the Value of the Collection, and therefore must not be taken as a just basis for estimating it.

Two Valuations, and only two in detail, have been laid before your Committee, which are printed; differing most widely in the particulars, and in the total; that of



Mr. *Payne Knight* amounting to £25,000; and that of Mr. *Hamilton* to £60,800.

The only other sum mentioned as a money price, is in the evidence of the Earl of *Aberdeen*, who named £35,000, as a sort of conjectural estimate of the whole, without entering into particulars.

In addition to the instances of prices quoted in Mr. *Payne Knight's* evidence, the sums paid for other celebrated Marbles deserve to be brought under the notice of the House.

The *Townley* Collection, which was purchased for the British Museum in June 1805, for £20,000, is frequently referred to in the examinations of the witnesses, with some variety of opinion as to its intrinsic value: but it is to be observed of all the principal Sculptures in that Collection, that they were in excellent condition, with the surface perfect; and where injured, they were generally well restored, and perfectly adapted for the decoration, and almost for the ornamental furniture of a private house, as they were indeed disposed by Mr. *Townley* in his lifetime.

In what proportion the state of mutilation in which the *Elgin* Marbles are left, and above all the corrosion of much of the surface by weather, reduce their value, it is difficult precisely to ascertain: but it may unquestionably be affirmed, in the words of one of the Sculptors examined, (who rates these Works in the highest class of Art,) that “the *Townleyan* Marbles being entire, are, in a commercial point of view, the most valuable of the two: but that the *Elgin* Marbles, as possessing that matter which Artists most require, claim a higher consideration.”

The *Ægina* Marbles, which are also referred to, and were well known to one of the Members of Your Committee, who was in treaty to purchase them for the British Museum, sold for £6,000, to the Prince Royal of Bavaria, which was less than the British Government had directed to be offered, after a prior negotiation for obtaining them had failed: their real value, however, was supposed not to exceed £4,000; at which *Lusieri* estimated them. They are described as valuable in point of remote antiquity, and curious in that respect, but of no distinguished merit as specimens of Sculpture, their style being what is usually called Etruscan, and older than the age of *Phidias*.

The Marbles at *Phigalia*, in *Arcadia*, have lately been purchased for the Museum at the expense of £15,000, increased by a very unfavourable exchange to £19,000, a sum which your Committee, after inspecting them, ventured to consider as more than equal to their value.

It is true that an English gentleman, concerned in discovering them, was ready to give the same sum; and therefore no sort of censure can attach on those who purchased them abroad, for our national Gallery, without any possible opportunity of viewing and examining the sculpture, but knowing them only from the sketches which were sent over, and the place where they were dug up, to be undoubted and authentic remains of Greek artists of the best time.

When the first offer was made by the Earl of *Elgin* to Mr. *Percival*, of putting the Public in possession of this Collection, Mr. *Long*, a member of your Committee, was authorized by Mr. *Percival* to acquaint Lord *Elgin*, that he was willing to propose to

Parliament to purchase it for £30,000, provided Lord *Elgin* should make out, to the satisfaction of a Committee of the House of Commons, that he had expended so much in acquiring, and transporting it.

Lord *Elgin* declined this proposal, for the reasons stated by him in his evidence: and until the month of June 1815, no further step was taken on either side; but at that time a petition was presented, on the part of Lord *Elgin*, to the House, which, owing to the late period of the Session, was not proceeded upon. Eighty additional cases have been received since 1811, the contents of which, enumerated in Mr. *Hamilton's* evidence, now form a part of the Collection. The Medals also, of which the value is more easily defined, were not included in the proposal made to Mr. *Percival*.

Against these augmentations must be set the rise in the value of money, which is unquestionably not inconsiderable, between the present time and the year 1811; a cause or consequence of which is the depreciation of every commodity, either of necessity, or fancy, which is brought to sale.

Your Committee, therefore, do not think that they should be justified, in behalf of the Public, if they were to recommend to the House any extension of Mr. *Percival's* offer to a greater amount than £5,000: and, under all the circumstances that they have endeavoured to bring under the view of the House, they judge Thirty-five Thousand Pounds to be a reasonable and sufficient price for this Collection.

Your Committee observing, that by the Act 45 Geo. III. c. 127, for vesting the *Townleyan* Collection in the Trustees of the British Museum, § 4, the proprietor of that Collection, Mr. *Townley Standish*, was added to the Trustees of the British Museum, considered the Earl of *Elgin* (and his heirs being Earls of *Elgin*) as equally entitled to the same distinction, and recommend that a clause should be inserted to that effect, if it should be necessary that an Act should pass for transferring his Collection to the Public.

---

It may not be deemed foreign to this subject, if your Committee venture to extend their observations somewhat beyond the strict limit of their immediate inquiry, and lay before the House what occurs to them as not unimportant with regard to the age and authenticity of these Sculptures. The great works with which Pericles adorned and strengthened Athens, were all carried on under the direction and superintendance of Phidias: for this, there is the authority of various ancient writers, and particularly of Plutarch; but he distinctly asserts in the same passage, that Callicrates and Ictinus executed the work of the Parthenon; which is confirmed also by Pausanias, so far as relates to Ictinus, who likewise ornamented or constructed the temple of Apollo at Phigalia\*; from whence, by a singular coincidence, the Sculptures in high relief lately purchased for the British Museum, and frequently referred to in the evidence, were transported.

The style of this work, in the opinion of the Artists, indicates that it belongs

\* The penultimate syllable should be pronounced long: Phigalia closes two hexameter verses; one of which is quoted by Pausanias, and the other by Stephanus Byzantinus, from Rhianus, a Poet of Crete.

to the same period, though the execution is rated as inferior to that of the *Elgin Marbles*. In the fabulous stories which are represented upon both, there is a very striking similarity; and it may be remarked in passing, that the subjects of the *Metopes*, and of the smaller *Frize*, which is sculptured with the battle of the *Amazons*, correspond with two out of the four subjects mentioned by *Pliny*, as adorning the shield and dress of the *Minerva*; so that there was a general uniformity of design in the stories which were selected for the internal and external decoration of the *Parthenon*. The taste of the same artist, *Ictinus*, probably led him to repeat the same ideas, which abound in graceful forms, and variety of composition, when he was employed upon the temple of another divinity, at a distance from *Athens*.

The statue of *Minerva* within the Temple, was the work of *Phidias* himself; and, with the exception of the *Jupiter* which he made at *Elis*, the most celebrated of his productions. It was composed of ivory and gold; with regard to which, some very curious anecdotes relating to the political history of that time, are to be found in the same writers; the earliest of which, from a passage in a cotemporary poet, *Aristophanes*, proves that the value of these materials involved both *Pericles* and the director of his works in great trouble, and jeopardy; upon which account the latter is said to have withdrawn to *Elis*, and to have ended his days there, leaving it doubtful whether his death was natural, or in consequence of a judicial sentence: but *Plutarch* places his death at *Athens*, and in prison, either by disease, or by poison.

It has been doubted whether *Phidias* himself ever wrought in *Marble*: but, although, when he did not use ivory, his chief material was unquestionably bronze; there are authorities sufficient to establish, beyond all controversy, that he sometimes applied his hand to *Marble*. *Pliny*, for instance, asserts that he did so, and mentions a *Venus* ascribed to him, existing in his own time in the collection (or in the portico) of *Octavia*. *Phidias* is called by *Aristotle* a skilful worker in *Stone*; and *Pausanias* enumerates a *Celestial Venus* of *Parian Marble*, undoubtedly of his hand; and the *Rhamnusian Nemesis*, also of the same material. Some of his statues in bronze, were brought to *Rome* by *Paulus Æmilius*, and by *Catullus*.

His great reputation, however, was founded upon his representations of the Gods, in which he was supposed more excellent than in human forms, and especially upon his works in ivory, in which he stood unrivalled\*.

*Elidas* the *Argive* is mentioned as the master of *Phidias*; which honour is also shared by *Hippias*. His two most celebrated scholars were *Alcamenes* an *Athenian* of noble birth, and *Agoracritus* of *Paros*; the latter of whom was his favourite; and it was reported, that out of affection to him, *Phidias* put his scholar's name upon several of his own works: among which the statue called *Rhamnusian Nemesis* is particularized by *Pliny*, and *Suidas*.

In another passage of *Pliny*, *Alcamenes* is classed with *Critias*, *Nestocles*, and *Hegias*, who are called the rivals of *Phidias*. The name of *Colotes* is preserved as another of his scholars.

The other great Sculptors who were living at the same time with *Phidias*, and flourished very soon after him, were *Agelades*, *Callon*, *Polycletus*, *Phragmon*, *Gorgias*, *Lacon*, *Myron*, *Pythagoras*, *Scopas*, and *Perelius*.

The passage in which *Pausanias* mentions the Sculptures on the pediments is

\* *Quintilian*, xiii. c. 10.

extremely short, and to this effect: "As you enter the Temple, which they call Parthenon, all that is contained in what is termed the (*Eagles*) Pediments, relates in every particular to the birth of Minerva; but on the opposite or back front is the Contest of Minerva and Neptune for the land; but the statue itself is formed of ivory and gold." The state of dilapidation into which this Temple was fallen, when Stuart visited it in 1751, and made most correct drawings for his valuable work, left little opportunity of examining and comparing what remained upon that part of the Temple, with the passage referred to: but an account is preserved by travellers, who about 80 years earlier found one of these pediments in tolerable preservation, before the war between the Turks and Venetians, in 1687, had done so much damage to this admirable structure. The observations of one of these (Dr. Spon, a French Physician) may be literally translated thus:

"The highest part of the front which the Greeks called 'the Eagle,' and our architects 'the Fronton,' is enriched with a groupe of beautiful figures in marble, which appear from below as large as life. They are of entire relief, and wonderfully well worked. Pausanias says nothing more, than that this Sculpture related to the birth of Minerva. The general design is this:

"Jupiter, who is under the highest angle of the pediment (fronton), has the right arm broken, in which, probably, he held his thunderbolt; his legs are thrown wide from each other, without doubt to make room for his eagle. Although these two characteristics are wanting, one cannot avoid recognising him by his beard, and by the majesty with which the sculptor has invested him. He is naked, as they usually represented him, and particularly the Greeks, who, for the most part, made their figures naked: on his right is a statue, which has its head and arms mutilated, draped to about half the leg, which one may judge to be a Victory; which precedes the car of Minerva, whose horses she leads. They are the work of some hand as bold as it was delicate, which would not, perhaps, have yielded to Phidias, or Praxiteles, so renowned for (representing) horses. Minerva is sitting upon the car, rather in the habit of goddess of the sciences than of war; for she is not dressed as a warrior, having neither helmet, nor shield, nor head of Medusa upon her breast: she has the air of youth, and her head-dress is not different from that of Venus. Another female figure, without a head, is sitting behind her, with a child, which she holds upon her knees. I cannot say who she is; but I had no trouble in making out or recognising the two next, which are the last on that side: it is the Emperor Hadrian, sitting and half naked; and, next to him, his wife Sabina. It seems that they are both looking on with pleasure at the triumph of the goddess. I do not believe that, before me, any person observed this particularity, which deserves to be remarked: "On the left of Jupiter are five or six figures, of which some have lost the heads; it is probably the circle of the gods, where Jupiter is about to introduce Minerva, and to make her be acknowledged for his daughter. The pediment behind represented, according to the same author, the dispute which Minerva and Neptune had for naming the city; but all the figures are fallen from them, except one head of a sea-horse, which was the usual accompaniment of this god: these figures of the two pediments were not so ancient as the body of the Temple built by Pericles; for which there wants no other argument than that of the statue of Hadrian, which is to be seen there, and the marble, which is whiter than the rest. All the rest has not been touched. The Marquis de Nointel had designs made of the whole, when he went to Athens: his painter worked there for two months, and almost lost his eyes, because he

was obliged to draw every thing from below, without a scaffold.”—(*Voyage par Jacob Spon ; Lyons, 1678 ; 2 tom. p. 144.*)

Wheler, who travelled with Spon, and published his work at London (four years later) in 1682, says: “ But my companion made me observe the next two figures sitting in the corner to be of the Emperor Hadrian and his Empress Sabina, whom I easily knew to be so, by the many medals and statues I have seen of them.” And again: “ But the Emperor Hadrian most probably repaired it, and adorned it with those figures at each front: for the whiteness of the Marble, and his own statue joined with them, apparently show them to be of a later age than the first, and done by that Emperor’s command. Within the portico on high, and on the outside of the cella of the Temple itself, is another border of basso relievo round about it, or at least on the North and South sides, which, without doubt, is as ancient as the Temple, and of admirable work, but not so high a relievo as the other. Thereon are represented sacrifices, processions, and other ceremonies of the heathens’ worship. Most of them were designed by the M. de Nointel, who employed a painter to do it two months together, and showed them to us when we waited on him at Constantinople.”

Another French author, who published three years earlier than Spon, a work called “ *Athenes Ancienne & Nouvelle, par le S<sup>r</sup> de la Guilletiere, à Paris,*” 1675,—says, “ Pericles employed upon the Parthenon the celebrated architects Callicrates and Ictinus. The last, who had more reputation than the former, wrote a description of it in a book\*, which he composed on purpose, and which has been lost; and we should probably not now have the opportunity of admiring the building itself, if the Emperor Hadrian had not preserved it to us, by the repairs which he caused to be done. It is to his care that we owe the few remains of antiquity which are still entire at Athens.

In the *Antiquities of Athens* by Stuart, vol. ii. p. 4, it is said, “ Pausanias gives but a transient account of this Temple, nor does he say whether Hadrian repaired it, though his statue, and that of his Empress Sabina in the western pediment, have occasioned a doubt whether the sculptures, in both, were not put up by him. Wheler and Spon were of this opinion, and say they were whiter than the rest of the building. The statue of Antinous, now remaining at Rome, may be thought a proof that there were artists in his time capable of executing them; but this whiteness is no proof that they were more modern than the Temple, for they might be made of a whiter marble; and the heads of Hadrian and Sabina might be put on two of the ancient figures, which was no uncommon practice among the Romans; and if we may give credit to Plutarch, the buildings of Pericles were not in the least impaired by age in his time; therefore, this Temple could not want any material repairs in the reign of Hadrian.”

With regard to the works of Hadrian at Athens, Spartian says, “ that he did much for the Athenians †;” and a little after, on his second visit to Athens, “ going to the East he made his journey through Athens, and dedicated the works which he had begun there: and particularly a temple to Olympian Jupiter, and an altar to himself.”

The account given by Dion Cassius, is nearly to the same effect; adding, that he placed his own statue within the temple of Olympian Jupiter, which he erected ‡.

He called some other cities after his own name, and directed a part of Athens to be styled Hadrianopolis §: but no mention is made by any ancient author, of his touch-

\* Ictinus and Carpon were jointly concerned in this work, for which we have the authority of Vitruvius, lib. 7. præfat.

† Folio edit. 1620, p. 6.

‡ b. 69. c. 16.

§ Spartian, p. 10.

ing, or repairing the Parthenon. Pausanias, who wrote in his reign, says, that "the temples which Hadrian either erected from the foundation, or adorned with dedicated gifts and decorations, or whatever donations he made to the cities of the Greeks, and of the Barbarians also, who made application to him, were all recorded at Athens in the temple common to all the gods \*."

It is not unlikely, that a confused recollection of the statue which Hadrian actually placed at Athens, may have led one of the earliest travellers into a mistake, which has been repeated and countenanced by subsequent writers: but Mr. Fauvel, who will be quoted presently, speaks as from his own examination and observation, when he mentions the two statues in question; which, it is to be observed, still remain (without their heads) upon the pediment of the entrance, and have not been removed by Lord *Elgin*.

An exact copy of these drawings, by the Marquis de Nointel's painter, is given in Stuart's Antiquities of Athens, vol. iv. chap. 4. plates 1, 2, 3, and 4, which are rendered more valuable on account of the destruction of a considerable part of the Temple, in the Turkish war, by the falling of a Venetian bomb, within a short time after the year in which they were made; which, however, must have been prior to the date of 1683, which has been affixed to them.

Some notes of Mr. Fauvel, a painter and antiquary, who moulded and took casts from the greatest part of the Sculptures, and remained fifteen years at Athens, are given with the engravings of these drawings; in which it is said, with regard to these pediments, chap. iv. page 21, "These figures had bronze ornaments, at least if one may judge from the head of Sabina A, plate 5, which having fallen off, being much mutilated, has been brought to Mr. Fauvel, holes may still be observed, apparently to receive little gudgeons of bronze, by which the crown was fastened. The head B of the Emperor Hadrian still remains. This group has probably been supplied afterwards in honour of this Emperor: it is of a different workmanship from the other figures.

---

YOUR Committee cannot dismiss this interesting subject, without submitting to the attentive reflection of the House, how highly the cultivation of the Fine Arts has contributed to the reputation, character, and dignity of every Government by which they have been encouraged, and how intimately they are connected with the advancement of every thing valuable in science, literature, and philosophy. In contemplating the importance and splendour to which so small a republic as Athens rose, by the genius and energy of her citizens exerted in the path of such studies, it is impossible to overlook how transient the memory and fame of extended empires and of mighty conquerors are, in comparison of those who have rendered inconsiderable states eminent, and immortalized their own names by these pursuits. But if it be true, as we learn from history and experience, that free governments afford a soil most suitable to the production of native talent, to the maturing of the powers of the human mind, and to the growth of every species of excellence, by opening to merit the prospect of reward and distinction, no country can be better adapted than our own to afford an honourable asylum to these monuments of the school of *Phidias*, and of the administration of *Pericles*; where, secure from further injury and degradation, they may receive that admiration and homage to which they are entitled, and serve in return as models and examples to those, who by knowing how to revere and appreciate them, may learn first to imitate, and ultimately to rival them.

March 25, 1816.