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Abstract

The object (no. inv. 1227), the so-called head of “Goddess of Butrint” and the head of "Apollo, the Anzio’s type", was discovered in the area of the theatre of Butrint during the excavation campaign (1928) by Luigi Maria Ugolini. In addition to the head, a large set of sculptures were discovered. After a detailed examination of them, Ugolini combined the head with one of the found statues, that of the "Nemesis of Rhamnous" type, and called the whole statue “Goddess of Butrint”. It is being said that in 1930 the head was presented to Mussolini by King Zog, but the whole statue, head-and-body, has been displayed to the Albanian pavilion of the ‘Mostra d'Oltremare’ in Naples in 1940. The body don’t seem to have been returned to Albania, because it was destroyed by allied bombardment in 1943, whereas the head of "Goddess of Butrint" has been returned in 1982. The lost body and the stylistic and material differences between the body and the head of the statue have influenced how the object no. 1227 is treated. Due to these factors, in most of the scientific debate by foreign and Albanian scholars, the object is considered as a fragmentary and at the same time unique sculpture. Consequently, it had widely been interpreted and known as the head of Apollo of the Anzio’s type, from a prototype of Praxiteles school, whose dating was determined to belong to either the fourth century BC or the Julio-Claudian’s dynasty. This paper, based on the historical grounds, on the analysis of stylistic trends in sculpture and on the analysis of stylistic sculptural elements, turns the focus on the so-called "Goddess of Butrint" statue as a whole. Consequently, it is concluded that the object no. 1227, together with the statue of "Nemesis of Rhamnous" type, is a representation of a mythological paradigm where the goddess Themis merges with the god Apollo as symbols of the victory of Augustus in Actium and of the inauguration of a new cult - of the (pre) deification of Livia. It is also concluded that, from the perspective of the work of the sculptor, it has been taken into account a model of Apollo Anzio’s type and interpreted with feminine characteristics. Technically, the head has been worked on the front part and from the back it has only been sketched, presenting a variety of stone carving stages. Also the head is asymmetrical and the signs of polychrome residues appear on it.

1. Historical grounds

“Dea”, “The head of Dea”, “Dea of Butrint”, “The head of Apollo”: all these names recall the most famous sculptural portrait in the history of Albanian sculpture, being it antiquity or any other period. This sculpture is displayed in the permanent exhibition of Antiquities’ Department of National History Museum in Tirana, Albania. It can be found everywhere, from miniature to real life size, in all kind of materials and artistic production techniques. The image, but also its name, is used to identify Albanian heritage, thus becoming a source of profit, satisfaction, trust, and prestige. Its fame was predefined from its birth: it was the first sculpture that marked the discovery of the large group of statues and the Butrint Theatre1 by the Italian Archaeological Mission in Albania, during the 1928 excavation campaign. The Head of Mission, Ugolini described and contextualized the object in this way: "... during the excavation

---

1 This discovery was reported immediately to the Foreign Ministry, and a huge flood of articles, chronicle movies and lectures [in Italian auditoriums] over the next two years gave the discovery a very high importance. For more refer to (Gilkes 2002, 5).
2 The mission was established in 1924, with the support of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. See: (Gilkes 2002, 5). In 1924, the mission led by Luigi M. Ugolini had the first trip to Albania. During his second trip, in 1928, Ugolini, "with the thirst for discovering the archaeological substrate of Albania" (Ugolini 2009, 9), spotted the Butrint ruins (Gilkes 2003, 23; Ugolini 2000, 78–80), oriented by the Aeneas journey and the topographical details described by Virgil and the geographers of Antiquity (Ugolini 2000, 17, 20). For detailed information on the Mission's work see: Lida Miraj (Gilkes 2003, 32–33).
of the theatre, in fact when we were intent on liberating the scena of the theatre from the earth, a workman announced from his section that there was 'something rounded' in the middle of the quagmire of the excavations. I leapt into the trench, convinced that it was a piece of sculpture and replaced him in the delicate task of extraction. I began the work full of expectancy - it really was a head, and one that appeared to have a perfect profile! [Fig.1/a] ... The head was intact... (it) was a Greek original of the best work; the head of the 'Goddess of Butrint'. "3 [Fig.1/b]

Fig. 1/a: The Head of "Goddess of Butrint", right profile, MHK (photo I.B.)

Fig. 1/b: The Head of "Goddess of Butrint", frontal view, MHK.

3 The short description is given. For details see: (Ugolini 2000, 47–48). The original was published in 1937, see: (Ugolini 1937)
Further, after the body was found, the thought was reinforced by adding that "... no mistake was made" by dividing the two parts that were different from the beginning by means of technique, style, period of time and even marble’s quality." (Ugolini 2000, 60) Being certain about it, he further elaborates by describing:

"Almost two and a half meters long ... the statue is well preserved ... [Fig:2/a-2/b] It consists of two parts: one is the body, a Roman copy of a Greek prototype of the second half of the 5th century BC, that is thought to be of the Phidias school... The other part of the statue, a Greek head, is placed on the body. It is of a great beauty: oval face, the modern style of hair combing, looking like haunted in dreams, and generally the style and the treatment of muscle plans connect this work with the series of works of ... Praxiteles. ... the body and the head are completely two different parts, from both, style and period of time, except from the quality of marble: that of the head comes from the Greek islands, and the one used for the body is the so-called "Greeks", with cooler colours and smaller crystals than the other... Time wise, the head is older than the body, but it is newer from style point of view. It can be thought that the time difference between the two works is nearly three and a half centuries, and the styles differ only a century and a half. "(Ugolini 2000, 137–41)

Fig. 2/a: The statue of "Goddess of Butrint", frontal view (after Ugolini 1928);
Fig. 2/b: The statue of "Goddess of Butrint", left profile (after Ugolini 1928)

From the above, during the analysis of head’s and body’s data, Ugolini had doubts about their exact designation, falling again in the same initial hypothesis raised during the discovery of the head. In fact, this conclusion has not come so easy. Immediately after the head’s discovery, he published a detailed study about it, where he proposed - if not resolved - all the questions that arise from the examination of the head and the body (Ugolini 1928, 266). And in reality, after

---

4 The text in italic is according to the publication in Albanian of Ugolini, in the relevant citation.
describing the discovery and the state of conservation of the object, a detailed examination of the statue, head and body, is done.

Initially, he suspected that the head could belong to other statues, but after many tests, the head matched only with this stature. The compatibility between the head and the body is supported by 1) the location where the objects were located separately 2) the comparison with the other sculptures found under niches 3) the compatibility between the bulb (tenon) under the neck and the socket between the stature’s shoulders 4) leaving it unworked at the back of both, the head and the body, for which he thinks that are conceptualized and executed to be seen just from the front (Ugolini 1928, 268). According to him, the compatibility does not mean that they have been always together. He assumes and believes that "at a certain period of antiquity, and more specifically at the time before the fall of the statue, on the fourth niche had been placed a sculpture that had the body and head we are talking about."(Ugolini 1928, 268) [Fig.3].

![Fig. 3: Reconstructed elevation of the northern face of the stage building, by Carlo Ceschi. (Franco Ceschi) (after Gilkes 2003); "The Goddess of Butrint" is placed in the fourth niche and the stain, representing the Head of Dea, is superimposed by I.B.](image)

After concluding the analysis on compatibility and dating, Ugolini examines the question whether this type of head is male or female. From the comparison of the Head of Butrint with the portraits of Hygeia of Athens, Apollo in Palazzo Vecchio - Florence, Apollo Leconfield [Fig. 4], the Apollo of Venice, the head of the Young Boy of Boston and that of the Kore of Vienna, and from the persistent fact that the sculptor who adapted the head with the body thought of the head as a female, Ugolini concludes that the Head of Butrint: 1) is a representation of a female portrait where the ideal element dominates the naturalist one; 2) it is an original, rather than a copy of an original work, even if deeply inspired by a prototype of the great Athenian artist Praxiteles (Ugolini 1928, 277–78).
A few years later, thanks to the exhibition of Butrint's Head to Italy, it became part of a study by M. Marella (Johnson 1941, 203). According to her, "the 'Goddess of Butrint' translates the bronze style of an original into a marble style, in the Hellenistic period...the head is a Roman copy of this Helenistic remodelling. It was probably set on a female statue." (Picard 1941, 136; Bieber 1940, 561).

In addition to the above research, the Albanian ones were developed, in the absence of the object discovered by Ugolini, as well as in the conditions of installing the communist system. After the war, efforts are made to surpass the definitions of Ugoli in "Myth of Aeneas". In 1958, Prendi did the first step on naming the sculpture as a representation of the God Apollo, thinking that the head was worked during the Hellenistic period according to a type of Apollo of the century IV B.C. (Prendi 1958, 22). In 1971, M. Korkuti defines the sculpture as Apollo, worked according to the Praxitelean School of the century IV BC in the album "Archeological Albania" (Korkuti 1971, Diciturat: 4). Until the return of the so-called "Goddess of Butrint " in Albania in 1982, these writings were the only scientific references about it in Albanian studies. Upon its return, S. Islami writes on the technique, context, style, period and the author. Further, he argues why this portrait is called "The Head of Apollo" and consequently sets another creation date. For him, the head is related to the group of other sculptures that were found in front of the theater and the technique with which it was worked proves that it is the production of the century I A.D., done by a famous local master (Islami 1982, 279–80). Three years after his article, "Goddess" is added in the Albanian Encyclopedic Dictionary. Its explanation is based on the above writings, but the evaluation of prof. Islami is not reflected. In 1988 appears the first study on "The Goddess" (Budina 1988, 90–92; TAB. XII,3; TAB. XIII,1), which marks the opening of the academic debate about its dating and its originality. Budina, comparing Ugolini's evaluation with that of S. Islami and N. Ceka, states that "S. Islami's opinion seems not very convincing." (Budina 1988, 91). Based on the fact that there is a big difference between the quality of marble and the working style of the body and the head of the statue, he continues the Ceka’s opinion that the head 1) is a work of the series of Praxitelean School or his students and dates back to the first half of century. IV B.C.; 2)

---

5 The Voice of the Head in this Dictionary served as a core bibliography on the museum file of the object in question. According to this data, this facility is recognized, published and promoted today by the National History Museum.
presents some of Apollo's features, which in Greek art is treated with a feminine beauty: the nose and forehead line, the combed hair, the slight emphasis on the Adam’s apple, the light opening of the lips; 3) The neck bending of the head is related to the movement of the body ... (which should have existed). Based on these, he raises the hypothesis: Due to the long stay in theater niches, exposed to atmospheric factors, the weaker part of the sculpture, such as the body, has been damaged. For this reason, in the century I-II, it was needed to make another body for this head. There is no quotation in Budina's article where N. Ceka mentions these evaluations (Budina 1988, 91–92). N. Ceka himself, in the same year, claims that the work is a Roman copy from the period of the Flavians (v. 69-96 AD), known as "Apollo of type Anzio" [Fig.5] (Albanien 1988, 395–396; Obj. Nr. 313). Papadopoulos (Papadopoulos 1996) and Bergemann (Bergemann 1998, 138–40) as well mentioned the same about the naming, where, through Gilkes, they fell to a common denominator by naming the Head as "Apollo of type Anzio", the so-called "Goddess of Butrint" (Gilkes 2002, 5).

![Fig. 5: Apollo of Anzio, Museo Nazionale Romano: Palazzo Massimo.](image)

In 2003, thanks to the work of a group of foreign and Albanian researchers, it was published the most complete study work known to date about Ugolin's excavation at the Butrint Theater (Gilkes 2003). The discovery of the Ugolini’s archive (assumed missing) and updating of these data through scholars and contributors to this work, complement the long-lost history. Thanks to this work, a lavish catalog is presented for all the statues, complete and fragments, found in the Theater. Consequently, in the great panorama of the Theater Reconstruction, the statue, body and head, of "Goddess of Butrint" is one of the twenty-two statues of the sculptural group (Gilkes 2003, 195) and one of the six statues that were found in the hyposcaenium and were supposed to have been placed in the niches (Gilkes 2003, 189). After some scientific debates on the placement of sculptural grouping in scaenae frons niches, the final order is believed to be illustrated in Fig.3 (Gilkes 2003, 176).
According to this plan, the "Goddess of Butrint" is located in the fourth niche (Gilkes 2003, 248), starting from the east. Whereas, regarding the creator and the site of the creation of the sculptural group, Pojani, the researcher, raises hypotheses about local production of torso and import of the head (Gilkes 2003, 248).

Within this collection of sculptural material, the subject of the head of the Goddess is no longer touched, as the focus is on the sculptures’ corpus in general. Thus, its dating remains that the head is an original Greek of post-praxitelean period, while the body is a Roman copy. And the denomination, with which the portrait is known within this work, is "The Head of the Goddess of Butrint".6

Although Bergemann is mentioned, his study is evaluated by the optics that the author did not have the benefit of having the opportunity to consult the manuscripts and photographs of Ugolini, or Ceschi’s drawings (Gilkes 2003, 196).

Pojani, after her previous statements, after two years makes a reevaluation of both the naming of the head and the assumed placement of the sculptural group, referring to Bergemann, Hodges and Hansen studies. She names the object in question as "a head of Apollo, of Anzium’s type". She also adds the hypothesis that "statues could have been brought to the theater area from elsewhere" (Pojani-Dhamo 2005, 213–14). With regard to their artistic level, she thinks that the sculptures discovered in Butrint represent examples of a provincial art of a very good quality (Pojani-Dhamo 2005, 217).

The Debate on the Head, the sculptural group placement and their dating continues further in the Hodges study.7 He defines sculpture as a rare feminine version of Apollo of Sorentin type (Hodges 2011, 40) and, through historian E. Bartman, adds that (the sculptures) should have been set up in the group around the year 27 BC-12 BC, where the group dated with more accuracy is that of Augustus, Livia, and Agrippa, to whom the head of Apollo may also be added (Hodges 2011, 89).

In 2006, M. Zeqo claims that Dea's head is the head of Apollo, which is similar to the head of Apollo found in Durrës (Zeqo 2006, 12–13). Also, in the catalog of objects of the National History Museum, he presents the object as "The Head of Apollo", the so-called "Dea of Butrint", which is a late replica of the Praxitelian school, worked in the century I AD (Zeqo 2000).

In 2007 and 2009, historian I.L.Hansen calls the head "Apollo of type Antium (Anzio)". She keeps the same view with E. Bartman for the dating of the sculptural group, expressing that it is possible that the appearance of the Goddess be related to the imperial group, based on the date and location where it was discovered, as the divine protector of victory in Actium. Further, she

---

6 For the places where it is mentioned see (Gilkes 2003, 59, 63–64, 71, 189, 196, 199, 206, 211–12, 232, 246–48, 250).
7 The original text is (Hodges 2006). References about this text are made according to its translation into Albanian (Hodges 2011).
thinks that because of the feminine features of the head, for a long time the object was identified as a female representation because it was linked to the body of a female so-called Nemesis of Rhamnous (Hansen 2007, 51–52, 2009, 52–53).

Seven years later, the exhibition "Ancient Cities and Landscape in Albania: A Century of Italian-Albanian Archaeological Research" was inaugurated in the spring of 2016, in premises of National History Museum. The Head of Dea was one of the exhibited objects. In the exhibition’s catalog, the Head of Dea is defined as a high quality replica of the original "Apollo of Anzio" sculpture dating back to the century. IV BC (Lepore and Muka 2016, 169).

Lately, in the history of the writings on Dea's head, it is the one presented by the scholar Sandro De Maria (De Maria 2018, 266, 267). Among the findings of Ugolini, he mentions the so-called "Dea of Butrint" as a head of Apollo from a prototype of Praxitelean School.

Thus, the supported documentation provided so far on the study of the object in question, presents the historical background upon which the following study arises.

2. Analysis and Interpretation

During the imperial period, in tenon-and-socket joints, issues are somewhat complicated by the increased likelihood of reuse (Claridge 1990, 144). The head-to-body connection suggests that the joining line coincides with the edge of the dressing and the end the appearance of the neck, which also reinforces the object of this examination [Fig.6]. What is apparent from the image, was also told by Ugolini (Ugolini 1928, 268). So, the tenon (bulb) of the head matches with the hole between the stature’s shoulders, although the material and stylistic difference of the two joined parts is quite clear. Above the bulb, Dea's head carving appears in a variety of phases.

Fig. 6: The head and bust of "Goddess of Butrint": fragment of the frontal view (after Ugolini 1928);
From Ugolin's examination (Ugolini 1928, 268), with which my analysis complies, it turns out that the head was worked very well at the front. At the back it was just sketched because the object was conceptualized and executed to be seen from the frontal view. Following the Ugolini’s generalizing conclusion and the traces of the carving technique according to the respective stages, (Adam 1966; Rockwell 1994) it was noted that the Head represents an escalating combination of these phases, from the frontal part to the back or vice versa. On both sides of the neck, starting from behind the ears and down, vertically, there is as a band a combination of phase (CD) [Fig 7], with marks left by the rasp, which is an intermediate area between the completed phase (D) and the one sketched (C), or an area between the front and back part of the object under consideration.

![Fig. 7: The signs of an abrasive tool: right and left profile of the Goddess' head (photo I.B.);](image)

The back of the neck and the head correspond with the carving stage (C), while the left side of the hair's knot and, underneath it, the skull portion, have simply a highlight of the complete form which corresponds with the phase (BC). At the back of the head, the orientation marks of the axis, which are also the ones of the head movement curve, are marked by the wide chisel in the two areas shown in Fig.8. Following this (imaginative) curve of the movement in the front part of the Head as well, it is observed that its bend is on the right. This movement of the Dea’s head, compared with the other heads of Apollon Anzio (Antium), is the only one that goes in the opposite direction between their movements. Also, its direction seems to have somehow imposed the processing balance of the object’s details.

![Fig. 8: At the back of the Goddess' head: the orientation marks of the axis by the wide chisel (photo I.B.)](image)
From the points obtained according to the principle of symmetry, measurements of the respective segments were performed. From them, it results that there is an asymmetry. It is noticed more clearly as well the neck anatomy which is treated as being of a woman, compared to the same detail on the heads of Apollo Anzio. This element was one of the main indicators that led Ugolini to determine that this object was representation of a female head (Ugolini 1928, 272,273). In his examination, he also detected the dimple in the middle of the chin, which Islami would affirm later on as well (Ugolini 1928, 268; Islami 1982, 279) but these remained at the stage of the finding. If see the explanation for this from Palagia and Lawton & Mauzy, (Palagia 2003b, 58,63; Lawton and Mauzy 2006, 27:23; Palagia 2006, 267, 268) understand that we are dealing with a sign that has mistakenly remained from the system of copying of the points on the marble copy, by the master of reproduction, whether by means of a compass or by a pointing machine [Fig.9].

![Fig. 9: Pointing machine applied to plaster model with unfinished marble head in the background. Museum of the Department of Archaeology, Athens University. Photo H. R Goette. (after Palagia 2006); The point on the chin of Goddess’ head (photo I.B.); Unfinished bust of Eubouleus. Athens, Agora S 2089. Photo American School of Classical Studies: Agora Excavations. (after Palagia 2006); Unfinished Roman portrait of a woman, from the Library of Pantainos, ca. a.d. 170. (after Lawton & Mauzy 2006).](image)

So far, this Copy is presented with the variety of phases (BC, C, CD, D) of carving, appearing to the public as a technically completed head. And in fact, from the Head’s examination it was noticed that there is a noticeable remnant of a yellow pigment in the left corner of the lip [Fig.10]. In the right corner of the lip there is a slight remnant and on the surface near this corner, on the cheek, there is a stratification as a veil of pigment, which leads to the conclusion that the head, over all the stages of carving, has been painted with the polychrome layer, that is, the final stage (E) is completed. In this case, a formulation for the use of stone carving technique would be: (BC, C, CD, D) + E.
Fig. 10: A noticeable remnant of a yellow pigment in the left corner of the Goddess' lip (photo I.B.)

Fig. 11: The Head of the Large Herculaneum Woman (after Ugolini 1928)

Within the "sculptural group", there is also a testimony, through images made by Ugolini, for the head of the Large Herculaneum Woman (Ugolini 1935) [Fig.11], where the clarity of the polychrome layer is firmly convincing, especially in the iris and the right eyeball. Likewise, by comparing the lines of Deas and the Large Herculaneum, it is noted that both have the same ideal spirit despite the fact that Herculaneum's head misses what Ugolini calls "typical Praxitelean delicacy of the softness of the plans, the so-called sfumato (gradient)" (Ugolini 1935, 80). Her head, which was part of the monolithic sculpture of the Large Herculaneum [Fig.12], was explained by Ugolini as a sculpture with strong praxitelean influence and with style and proportions by Lisipi (Ugolini 1935, 80). In addition to them, Dea's stature and Herculaneum's sculpture are carved with the same material. Their association with each other fits in with the above thoughts of S. Islami on the dating and authorship (Islami 1982, 280). Apart from its dating - also mentioned by the other scholars as per above – it is as well the one from Bartman and Hansen (Hansen 2007, 51; Hodges 2011, 61) linking the creation of the Head with the celebration of Augustus' victory in the Battle of Actium, dating it around 27-12 BC. After this battle, Apollo became the personal God of Augustus and the God with the most complex connections of the Roman successor emperors. Thus, Apollo and the Emperor were unified, by giving to each other such attributes: mostly political Apollo and deified Augustus (Graf 2008, 126–128,145; Hjort Lange 2009).
Also, during "the last decades of the Republic, struggles between competing warlords with dynastic ambitions spurred related changes in visual culture. In the year 35 BC, for the first time, the Senate voted public statues for living women: the portraits of Octavian's wife, Livia, and his sister Octavia. This was an unprecedented grant and functioned in particular ways within the heavy ideological climate of the triumviral period. The creation of the Augustinian Principate accelerated this process and it was essential to develop a new, more systematic image, one that was dynastic in intent and that included exemplary public representation of living women." (Trimble 2011, 41, 42). Within this atmosphere, we recall the conclusions done so far about the Dea's head. Her movement is quite the opposite of Anzio Apollo's movement. This head movement seems to be in harmony with the contrapposto of the stature. Also, the head has feminine features: the anatomy of the neck, the assembly of the head in a feminine body, and the interpretation of some of the authors that the Head is a rare feminine version of Apollo of Anzio attached on the statue’s stature of Nemesis of Rhamnous type. Although there were doubts about the matching of the head with the body of the statue, the examination of the two objects and their technically compatible tenon-and-socket connection with each other, done by Ugolini (Ugolini 1928), claim the opposite. Also, Trimble, relying on Ugolini and architect Carlo Ceschi's plan [Fig.3], thinks that this statue (head-stature) may have been a highly idealized representation of a woman of the highest rank. But also, the researcher takes into consideration the doubts whether this head belonged or not to this statue in antiquity. Consequently, she assumes that, if the union of the head with the stature was made in post-antique times, then, in its place, Livia's head [Fig.13] could probably be linked to this statue (Trimble 2011, 48).

8 In addition to the authors mentioned in the "Historical grounds" (Goette 1985, 28, n 1) recognized an eclectic combination between the Nemesis type and the Apollo head itself. - quoted in (Portale 2013, 224).
9 (Bergemann 1998, Fig.82a-b), (Bumke 2008, 122) - authors quoted at (Portale 2013, 219).
This assumption turns into an argument from Portale (Portale 2013, 225), according to which Bumke confirms the use of the early imperial versions of *Nemesis* with Livia’s portraits, arguing that "*Dea of Butrint* statue (at the time wrongly restored with an Apollo head and identified as Kore-Persephone) must have had in origin the head of Livia." (Portale 2013, 224–25). Further, by studying the role of woman in accordance with the hierarchy within *Domus Augusta* and by joining the *Nemesis* [Fig.2a-b] with the head of Livia [Fig.13], Portale claims that "Livia appears in a prominent position, expressed “alla greca”, acting like the charming Agorakitan goddess guarantor of *kosmos* and *taxis*, but remaining recognizable in her human aspect through the portrait-head (albeit idealized)." (Portale 2013, 231).

![Fig. 13: The Head of Livia, Archaeological Museum of Butrint (photo I.B.);](image)

Unfortunately, the stature does not exist and interpretations can be numerous or speculative. But, comparing Dea's head with that of Livia (its small size, bulbous shape and neck) and both heads with the over-life-size stature of Nemesis (Ugolini 1928), it is concluded that the head of Livia is unrelated (not matched) with the Nemesis stature, reaffirming Ugolini’s findings once more. In a comparative sequence, seeing Dea's head as that of the priestess Aristonoë [Fig.14] attached on the statue with the same name by Rhamnous, (Palagia 2003a, 543–44), it is noticed the great similarity between them - the neck’s anatomy, the shape of the tenon-and-socket joint, as well as the ideal prototype of a feminine portrait century IV BC.

![Fig. 14: Statue of the priestess Aristonoë, from Rhamnous. Athens, National Museum 232. (after Palagia 2003a).](image)
Further, if we look at Dea's head and stature, compared to the Themis and Nemesis statue [Fig. 15-16], the impression that they associate with one another is reinforced. Themis, the goddess of Justice, who was responsible for the inception of the Troy’s War, belonged to the generation of Titans; older than Zeus, she helped Zeus in shadow by acting as his advisor. (Palagia 2003a, 546) Themis and Nemesis, according to Palagia, are associated with Livia as a result of Claudius' dedication to his grandmother Livia, which he decreed "Goddess" through the Senate in A.D. 42 (Palagia 2003a, 546). Even before this date, Rome's links to Nemesis are documented through literature, dating back to the century I B.C. (Stafford 2013, 227, 232–34). In line with this thought, it is agreed that what is called "the image of ultrix Rhamnousia" seemed familiar to the Roman public and is an ideal partner for the empress in her special status as Augustus' wife. Also, at that time, the aphidrymata practice is emphasized as an important reason for sculptural copying, in order to reproduce not the aura of original artistic creation by a well-known sculptor, but the exact identity of the divinity or the hero that is object of the cult (Portale 2013, 234; Stafford 2013, 231). Thus, given the above, as well as the connection between Troy-Actium-Butrint-Augustus (Hansen 2007), it can be said that we are dealing with a statue where the divinity of Themis is intertwined with the divinity of Apollo, under which is hidden the inauguration of a new cult - (pre) divinity of Livia. (Gkikaki 2016, 133–34)

![Fig. 15: Statue of the goddess Themis, Attica, by Chairestratos of Rhamnous. National Archaeological Museum of Athens.](image1)

![Fig. 16: Female divinity, Nemesis of Rhamnous type - 2nd century AD, copy of a cult statue from the sanctuary of Rhamnous in Attica, attributed to Agorakritos (430 BC). Naples Archaeological Museum.](image2)

In other words, after the above study, it is concluded that the so-called Head of "Goddess of Butrint", together with its stature of Nemesis of Rhamnous type, is a representation of a mythological paradigm where the Goddess Themis and God Apollo are intertwined, as symbols for the victory of Augustus at Actium and for the inauguration of a new cult, that of the (pre)deification of Livia. From the standpoint of the sculptor's work, the artwork is based on a model of Apollo of Anzio type and interpreted with female features.
During this work, technically, the head is worked on the front part and the back is only sketched, presenting a variety of stone carving stages. Also, it is asymmetrical and shows signs of polychrome residues. Above all, though controversial, today it is exposed at the National History Museum in Tirana, radiating that elegance and tenderness of a praxitelean style and echoing through time one of the most prominent sculptors of antiquity - Praxiteles.
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