


EULIMENE

Vol 2 (2001)

EULIMENE 2 (2001)



Attitudes to the Visual Arts of Classical Greece in Late Antiquity

Antonio Corso

doi: [10.12681/eul.32698](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.32698)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΗ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ,
ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ, ΤΗ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΠΥΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Τόμος 2
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2001

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ

ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ
Π. Μανουσάκη 5 – Β. Χάλη 8
GR 741 00 – Ρέθυμνο

PUBLISHER

MEDITERRANEAN
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
P. Manousaki 5 – V. Chali 8
GR 741 00 – Rethymno

ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ–ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)
Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Χανιά)

PUBLISHING DIRECTORS–EDITORS

Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymno)
Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Chania)

Η Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία και οι Εκδότες του περιοδικού ευχαριστούν θερμά την Ιερά Μονή Αρκαδίου, τον Δήμο Αρκαδίου και την Konstantin Travel Ε.Π.Ε. του κ. Κωνσταντίνου Κωνσταντινίδη για τις χορηγίες τους στη δαπάνη της έκδοσης.

Mediterranean Archaeological Society and the Editors wish to thank the Monastery of Arkadi, the Municipality of Arkadi and Mr. Konstantinos Konstantinides – Konstantin Travel (P.L.C.) for their sponsorship.

© ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 2001
EULIMENE

ISSN: 1108–5800

Επιστημονική Επιτροπή

Καθ. Πέτρος Θέμελης (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Νίκος Σταμπολίδης (Ρέθυμνο)
Δρ. Alan W. Johnston (Λονδίνο)
Καθ. Άγγελος Χανιώτης (Χαϊδελβέργη)
Δρ. Ιωάννης Τουράτσογλου (Αθήνα)
Καθ. Σοφία Καμπίτση (Ρέθυμνο)

Advisory Editorial Board

Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymno)
Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymno)
Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Heidelberg)
Dr. Alan W. Johnston (London)
Dr. Ioannis Touratsoglou (Athens)
Prof. Sophie Kambitsis (Rethymno)

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ είναι μία επιστημονική περιοδική έκδοση που περιλαμβάνει μελέτες στην Κλασική Αρχαιολογία, την Επιγραφική, τη Νομισματική και την Παπυρολογία εστιάζοντας στον Ελληνικό και Ρωμαϊκό κόσμο της Μεσογείου από την Υστερομινωϊκή / Υπομινωϊκή / Μυκηναϊκή εποχή (12^{ος} / 11^{ος} αι. π.Χ.) έως και την ύστερη αρχαιότητα (5^{ος} / 6^{ος} αι. μ.Χ.).

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ περιλαμβάνει επίσης μελέτες στην Ανθρωπολογία, Παλαιοδημογραφία, Παλαιοπεριβάλλον, Παλαιοβοτανολογία, Ζωοαρχαολογία, Αρχαία Οικονομία και Ιστορία των Επιστημών, εφόσον αυτές εμπίπτουν στα προαναφερθέντα γεωγραφικά και χρονικά όρια. Ευρύτερες μελέτες στην Κλασική Φιλολογία και Αρχαία Ιστορία θα γίνονται δεκτές, εφόσον συνδέονται άμεσα με μία από τις παραπάνω επιστήμες.

Παρακαλούνται οι συγγραφείς να λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις παρακάτω οδηγίες:

1. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται στην Ελληνική, Αγγλική, Γερμανική, Γαλλική ή Ιταλική γλώσσα. Κάθε εργασία συνοδεύεται από μια περίληψη περίπου 250 λέξεων σε γλώσσα άλλη από εκείνη της εργασίας.
2. Συντομογραφίες δεκτές σύμφωνα με το *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, ASP.
3. Τα γραμμικά σχέδια γίνονται με μαύρο μελάνι σε καλής ποιότητας χαρτί με ξεκάθαρους χαρακτήρες, ώστε να επιδέχονται σμίκρυνση. Οι φωτογραφίες είναι ασπρόμαυρες, τυπωμένες σε γυαλιστερό χαρτί. Όλα τα εικονογραφικά στοιχεία είναι αριθμημένα σε απλή σειρά.
4. Οι εργασίες στέλνονται σε δύο εκτυπωμένα αντίτυπα συνοδευόμενα από το κείμενο σε δισκέτα ηλεκτρονικού υπολογιστή.

Είναι υποχρέωση του κάθε συγγραφέα να εξασφαλίζει γραπτή άδεια για την αναπαραγωγή υλικού που έχει δημοσιευτεί αλλού ή είναι αδημοσίευτο.

Οι συγγραφείς θα λαμβάνουν δέκα αντίτυπα και έναν τόμο του περιοδικού. Επιπλέον αντίτυπα θα μπορούν να αγοραστούν.

Συνδρομές – Συνεργασίες – Πληροφορίες:

Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, Π. Μανουσάκη 5 – Β. Χάλη 8, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100

Δρ. Νίκος Λιτinas, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100

Δρ. Μανώλης Ι. Στεφανάκης, Καλύβες – Αποκορώνου, Χανιά – GR 73003

EULIMENE is a referred academic periodical which contains studies in Classical Archaeology, Epigraphy, Numismatics, and Papyrology, with particular interest in the Greek and Roman Mediterranean world. The time span covered by EULIMENE runs from the Late Minoan / Sub Minoan / Mycenaean period (12th / 11th cent. BC) through to the late Antiquity (5th / 6th cent. AD).

EULIMENE will also welcome studies on anthropology, palaeodemography, palaeo-environmental, botanical and faunal archaeology, the ancient economy and the history of science, so long as they conform to the geographical and chronological boundaries noted. Broader studies on Classics or Ancient History will be welcome, though they should be strictly linked with one or more of the areas mentioned above.

It will be very much appreciated if contributors consider the following guidelines:

1. Contributions should be in either of the following languages: Greek, English, German, French or Italian. Each paper should be accompanied by a summary of about 250 words in one of the above languages, other than that of the paper.
2. Accepted abbreviations are those of *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, ASP.
3. Line drawings should be in black ink on good quality paper with clear lettering, suitable for reduction. Photographs should be glossy black-and-white prints. All illustrations should be numbered in a single sequence.
4. Please send two hard copies of your text and one version on computer disc.

It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to quote or reproduce material which has appeared in another publication or is still unpublished.

Ten offprints of each paper, and a volume of the journal will be provided to the contributors free of charge. Additional offprints may be purchased.

Subscriptions – Contributions – Information:

Mediterranean Archaeological Society, P. Manousaki 5 – V. Chali 8, Rethymno – GR 74100

Dr. Nikos Litinas, University of Crete, Department of Philology, Rethymno – GR 74100

Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis, Kalives – Apokoronou, Chania – GR 73003

web : <http://www.phl.uoc.gr/eulimene/>

mail : eulimene@mail.com

Περιεχόμενα
ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 2 (2001)

List of contents
EULIMENE 2 (2001)

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti	7
A. Corso , Attitudes to the Visual Arts of Classical Greece in Late Antiquity	13
V. Karageorghis , Some innovations in the burial customs of Cyprus (12 th –7 th centuries BC)	53
D. Paleothodoros , Satyrs as shield devices in vase painting	67
Κ. Ρωμοπούλου , Πτηνοὶ Ἔρωτες ὑπνω εὔδοντες	93
M.W. Baldwin Bowsky , Gortynians and others: the case of the Antonii	97
I. Κολτσιδα–Μακρή , Ο θησαυρὸς Γυθείου <i>IGCH</i> 170	121
V.E. Stefanaki , Sur deux monnaies de bronze inédites d’Hiérapytna. Monnayage hiérapytnien et timbres amphoriques à l’époque hellénistique	129
M.D. Trifiró , The hoard Αρκαλοχώρι–Αστρίτσι 1936 (<i>IGCH</i> 154)	143
D. Jordan , Ψήγματα κριτικής, 4–10 [συνέχεια του άρθρου «Ψήγματα κριτικής», <i>Ευλιμένη</i> 1 (2000), 127–131]	155
A. Agelarakis , On the Clazomenian quest in Thrace during the 7 th and 6 th centuries BC, as revealed through Anthropological Archaeology	161
C. Bourbou , Infant mortality: the complexity of it all!	187

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti

Antonio Corso, Attitudes to the Visual Arts of Classical Greece in Late Antiquity, EYΛIMENH 2 (2001), 13–51

Attitudini tardoantiche nei confronti delle arti visive della Grecia classica. Argomento del presente articolo è lo studio dei diversi momenti tramite i quali la concezione dell'arte classica è progressivamente cambiata nel periodo che va dall'età dei Severi a quella di Giustiniano. Punto di partenza di questo processo è la tesi, asserita da Flavio Filostrato nella «Vita di Apollonio di Tiana», che l'arte di creare simulacri deve basarsi sulla *phantasia* e non sulla *mimesis*. Sempre a partire dall'età severiana, sale alla ribalta l'idea che i simulacri ottimali possano divenire abitacoli delle divinità rappresentate e siano pertanto magicamente provvisti della vita e delle facoltà di questi: tale concezione può essere appieno apprezzata nel *de statuis* di Callistrato. Inoltre, la concezione idealizzata delle arti visive di età classica, e soprattutto tardoclassica, considerate provviste di un messaggio edonistico, in seno alla seconda sofistica, comporta la condanna di queste produzioni artistiche da parte dei Padri della Chiesa, che ritengono i simulacri antichi corruttori dei costumi, oltrechè privi di valore dal punto di vista teologico. Tale condanna prelude alla distruzione di non pochi simulacri pagani praticata dai seguaci più estremisti del Cristianesimo tra 4 e 5 sec. Inoltre, il gusto cambia e, a partire dalla seconda metà del 4. sec., i palazzi e le ville provvisti di facciate scenografiche, le pitture e i mosaici ricchi di colori e involucranti gli spazi interni, piacciono di più talora delle opere d'arte antiche, in particolare delle statue. Tuttavia, a partire dal 4 sec., matura nella cultura cristiana il principio che si deve distinguere tra il pregio artistico delle statue classiche, che si può ammirare, e il loro contenuto religioso, che invece è inaccettabile. Questa distinzione sta alla base della fioritura di musei di statue antiche, in occidente durante il periodo fra l'ultimo quarto del 4. sec. e la prima metà del 5, a Costantinopoli tra Costantino e Giustiniano. L'articolo è chiuso da alcune note sull'affermazione in tale corso di tempo della convinzione che le statue in marmo di età classica non fossero colorate, ma mostrassero il colore del marmo, della tesi che la scultura era più importante della pittura nella Grecia classica, e infine di interpretazioni ingentilite, edonistiche e idealizzate dell'arte classica.

V. Karageorghis, Some innovations in the burial customs of Cyprus (12th – 7th centuries BC), EYΛIMENH 2 (2001), 53–65

Μερικές αλλαγές στα ταφικά έθιμα της Κύπρου (12^{ος}–7^{ος} αι. π.Χ.). Σ' αυτή τη μελέτη γίνεται προσπάθεια να καταδειχθούν οι αλλαγές στην ταφική αρχιτεκτονική και τα ταφικά έθιμα της Κύπρου κατά την περίοδο μεταξύ του 12^{ου} και του 7^{ου} αι. π.Χ., από την εποχή δηλαδή που εμφανίζονται στην Κύπρο οι πρώτες πολιτιστικές καινοτομίες κατά

τις αρχές του 12^{ου} αι. π.Χ. Οι αλλαγές στην ταφική αρχιτεκτονική κορυφώνονται κατά τον 11^ο αι. π.Χ. με την εμφάνιση των τάφων με στενόμακρο δρόμο και μικρό τετράπλευρο θάλαμο, που θα μεταφέρθηκαν στο νησί από το Αιγαίο, με την άφιξη των πρώτων Αχαιών αποίκων. Είναι τότε που παρατηρούνται και τα πρώτα δείγματα καύσης των νεκρών. Γίνεται εκτενής αναφορά στις «ηρωϊκές» ταφές του 8^{ου}-7^{ου} αι. και επιχειρείται σύγκριση με ανάλογα φαινόμενα στο Αιγαίο, ιδίως στην Κρήτη και την Ετρουρία, και συσχετίζονται τα νέα ταφικά έθιμα με τις νέες κοινωνικές δομές που χαρακτηρίζουν τις χώρες τις Μεσογείου, με την εμφάνιση της αριστοκρατικής άρχουσας τάξης και του ανάλογου τρόπου ζωής και συμπεριφοράς.

D. Paleothodoros, Satyrs as shield devices in vase painting, *EΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 2 (2001), 67–92

Σάτυροι ως επισήματα ασπίδων στην αγγειογραφία. Περίπου 120 αγγεία της αρχαϊκής και πρώιμης κλασικής περιόδου παρουσιάζουν ασπίδες με τη μορφή του σατύρου ως επίσημα. Τεχνοτροπικά, στον μελανόμορφο ρυθμό επικρατεί το θέμα της ανάγλυφης μάσκας, που εγκαινιάζει ο Κλειτίας, ενώ στον πρώιμο ερυθρόμορφο κυριαρχεί ο Επίκτητος με την εισαγωγή δύο θεμάτων, της μετωπικής μάσκας και της μάσκας σε προφίλ και σκιαγραφία. Η εικονογραφική και αρχαιολογική ανάλυση δείχνει ότι η επιλογή του συγκεκριμένου θέματος υπαγορεύεται από την επιθυμία των ζωγράφων να δημιουργήσουν μια εικονιστική ατμόσφαιρα, όπου κυριαρχούν οι αναφορές στον Διόνυσο και τον κόσμο του κρασιού.

K. Ρωμοπούλου, Πτηνοί Έρωτες ύπνω εΰδοντες, *EΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 2 (2001), 93–96

Sleeping Erotes in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens. Hellenistic plastic arts introduced a whole range of sleeping or resting types and styles; among them is the type of sleeping Eros in childlike appearance, which acquired great popularity in Roman times as a decorative statue for gardens or as a funerary statue symbolizing heroisation. The relation of Hypnos (Sleep) and Thanatos (Death) has been suggested as the reason for this subject becoming so popular in literature and art. In this article are presented two unpublished statuettes of sleeping Eros depicting two different types of Eros, products of Attic workshops. They are dated around the end of 1st and in the 2nd cent. AD.

M.W. Baldwin Bowsky, Gortynians and others: the case of the Antonii, *EΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 2 (2001), 97–119

Οι Γορτύνιοι και οι άλλοι: η περίπτωση των Αντωνίων. Για τη συγγραφή μιας βάσιμης ιστορίας της κοινωνίας στη ρωμαϊκή Κρήτη θα πρέπει στο πλούσιο και διαρκώς αυξανόμενο επιγραφικό υλικό της Γόρτυνας να γίνει μια διάκριση ανάμεσα στους Γορτυνίους και τους μη Γορτυνίους. Το όνομα Άντωνιος, διάφοροι φορείς του οποίου είναι γνωστοί στη Γόρτυνα από τον 1^ο π.Χ. έως τον 2^ο μ.Χ. αιώνα, αποτελεί ενδιαφέρον παράδειγμα ρωμαϊκού ονόματος γένους με εμπορικές αλλά και πολιτικές διασυνδέσεις. Στο άρθρο αυτό δίνεται ιδιαίτερη προσοχή στην παρουσίαση δύο περιπτώσεων. Η πρώτη είναι μια πρωτοδημοσιευμένη επιγραφή από τη Γόρτυνα, η οποία αναφέρεται σε

κάποιον Αντώνιο, αρχικά κάτοικο της Κυρήνης ή της Κυρηναϊκής, πριν αναλάβει πολιτικό αξίωμα στην αποικία της Κνωσού. Η δεύτερη περίπτωση, μια επιγραφή από την Έφεσο, αναφέρεται σε έναν κατά τα άλλα άγνωστο Γορτύνιο που διετέλεσε ιερέας της λατρείας του αυτοκράτορα· η επιγραφή αυτή μας επιτρέπει να τοποθετήσουμε τη λατρεία της Ίσιδας και του Αυγούστου στο πλαίσιο της κοινότητας των εμπόρων που είχαν εγκατασταθεί στην ελληνική Ανατολή πριν από τη μάχη του Ακτίου. Η ένταξη αυτού του αναθήματος του Αντωνίου στο ιστορικό του πλαίσιο, του 2^{ου} μ.Χ. αιώνα, μας επιτρέπει να συνδέσουμε τη συμμετοχή της Κρήτης στο Πανελλήνιον με την εξέλιξη της λατρείας του αυτοκράτορα στη Γόρτυνα και την επάνοδο της συγκλητικής διοίκησης στη Γόρτυνα. Οι Αντώνιοι που μαρτυρούνται στη Γόρτυνα —είτε είναι Γορτύνιοι είτε όχι— αντανακλούν επίσης την εκεί παρουσία πελατών και υποστηρικτών του Μάρκου Αντωνίου, του μέλους της τριανδρίας (όπως και στην Κόρινθο). Θα είναι αναγκαίο να επανεξετάσουμε την καθιερωμένη άποψη, ότι η Γόρτυνα υποστήριξε τον Οκταβιανό, ενώ η Κνωσός πήρε το μέρος του Αντωνίου.

I. Κολτσιδα–Μακρή, Ο θησαυρός Γυθείου *IGCH* 170, *EYAIMENH* 2 (2001), 121–128

The Gythion Hoard IGCH 170. *IGCH* 170 was found at Gythion of Laconia in 1938. It consists of 33 silver coin-issues often occurring in Peloponnesian hoards: 1 drachm of Aegina, 32 triobols of Sikyon, 1 tetradrachm of Antiochus I Soter. The drachm issue, with two dots on the reverse incuse, dates to the second half of the 4th century B.C. The triobols follow the so-called reduced Aeginetan standard, with an average weight of about 2.6 gr. each; these can be attributed to the very last years of the 4th up to the first decades of the 3rd century B.C. The tetradrachm of Antiochus I, minted in Seleucia on the Tigris c. 278–274 B.C., is important for the chronology of the find. In a total of 23 coin hoards found in the Peloponnese, buried in the period between the middle of the 4th and the 2nd century B.C., four include Seleucid tetradrachms (17 in all); see the table in p. 124, of which 8 were minted in Seleucia on the Tigris.

It is probably an emergency hoard connected either with the troubled times of Cleomenes III's war (228–222 B.C.) or the Social War (220–217 B.C.). Thus, the period around the year 220 B.C. is *grosso modo* suggested as the possible burial date. The Gythion find is another important hoard for the dating of the triobols of Sikyon and also provides further evidence for coin circulation in the Peloponnese during the second part of the 3rd century B.C.

V.E. Stefanaki, Sur deux monnaies de bronze inédites d'Hiérapytna. Monnayage hiérapytnien et timbres amphoriques à l'époque hellénistique, *EYAIMENH* 2 (2001), 129–142

Δύο αδημοσίευστα χάλκινα νομίσματα της Ιεράπυτνας: Ιεραπυτνιακά νομίσματα και σφραγίδες αμφορέων στην ελληνιστική εποχή. Η Ιεράπυτνα, φημισμένο λιμάνι της νοτιοανατολικής Κρήτης, κυρίως κατά τα ρωμαϊκά χρόνια, είχε ήδη αρχίσει να αναπτύσσεται στην ελληνιστική εποχή, από το τέλος του 3^{ου} και στις αρχές του 2^{ου} π.Χ. αιώνα. Το 145 π.Χ., μετά την κατάκτηση της γειτονικής Πραισού, έγινε η πιο δυνατή πόλη της Ανατολικής Κρήτης, όπως μαρτυρούν οι επιγραφικές και φιλολογικές πηγές.

Τα αργυρά της νομίσματα (τετράδραχμα, δίδραχμα και δραχμές), με την κεφαλή της Τύχης ως εμπροσθότυπο, κόπηκαν μεταξύ του 110 και του 80 π.Χ., και μαρτυρούν την οικονομική ευημερία της κατά την εποχή αυτή. Η ευημερία αυτή ήταν αποτέλεσμα τόσο της εδαφικής προσάρτησης της πλούσιας περιοχής της Πραισού όσο και της αύξησης της παραγωγής κρασιού στην χώρα της Ιεράπυτνας (με βλέψεις εμπορικές ή μη), όπως μαρτυρούν οι ενσφράγιστοι ιεραπυτνιακοί αμφορείς που βρέθηκαν στην Αλεξάνδρεια της Αιγύπτου, στην Καλλατία της Μαύρης Θάλασσας και στη μικρή χερσόνησο Τρυπητός στην περιοχή της Σητείας, όπου οι έρευνες έφεραν στο φως τμήμα σημαντικής ελληνιστικής πόλης.

Η μέλισσα που εμφανίζεται σε μία από τις σφραγίδες των αμφορέων ως επίσημο σύμβολο της Ιεράπυτνας, συναντάται επίσης στην οπίσθια όψη δύο χάλκινων ιεραπυτνιακών νομισμάτων, τα οποία βρίσκονται σήμερα στη νομισματική συλλογή του Ashmolean Museum στην Οξφόρδη. Ίσως η επιλογή της μέλισσας ως συμβόλου να είχε σχέση με την κατάκτηση της Πραισού από την Ιεράπυτνα, καθώς ο τύπος είναι χαρακτηριστικός των πραισιακών νομισμάτων.

Η επιγραφή που εμφανίζεται στη σφραγίδα του αμφορέα με τη μέλισσα και στα νομίσματα με τη μέλισσα, είναι το εθνικό των Ιεραπυτνίων σε συντετμημένη μορφή: ΙΕ. Σε άλλες σφραγίδες ιεραπυτνιακών αμφορέων εμφανίζεται ολόκληρο το εθνικό δηλ. ΙΕ(Α)ΡΑΠΥΤΝΙ[ΩΝ] καθώς και ονόματα αρχόντων, επώνυμων ή μη (ΣΩΣΟΣ, ΠΑΣΙΩΝ). Το ίδιο συμβαίνει και στα αργυρά νομίσματα της Ιεράπυτνας με την κεφαλή της Τύχης που αρχίζουν να κόβονται μετά το 110 π.Χ. Το εθνικό των Ιεραπυτνίων δεν εμφανίζεται ολόκληρο σε κανένα νόμισμα πριν το 110 π.Χ. και τα ονόματα των αρχόντων αρχίζουν να αναγράφονται στα νομίσματα της Ιεράπυτνας μέσα στο δεύτερο μισό του 2^{ου} π. Χ. αιώνα. Πρόκειται για την περίοδο κατά την οποία η Ιεράπυτνα αρχίζει να οργανώνει τη νομισματοκοπία της για να διευκολυνθεί ο οικονομικός και διοικητικός έλεγχος. Τον ίδιο έλεγχο άσκησε, πιθανώς την ίδια περίοδο, και στην διακίνηση των προϊόντων της. Από τα παραπάνω προκύπτει ότι οι ιεραπυτνιακοί αμφορείς καθώς και τα νομίσματα με τη μέλισσα, θα πρέπει να χρονολογηθούν μετά το 145 π.Χ. και μάλιστα προς το τέλος του δευτέρου μισού του 2^{ου} π.Χ αιώνα.

M.D. Trifiró, The hoard Αρκαλοχώρι–Αστρίτσι 1936 (*IGCH* 154), *ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 2 (2001), 143–154

Il tesoretto Αρκαλοχώρι–Αστρίτσι 1936 (IGCH 154). Il tesoretto *IGCH* 154, rinvenuto a Creta (località Astritsi), consta di emissioni argentee provenienti dalle città cretesi e da Cirene, Corinto e colonie, Argo, Tebe ed Egina. Sono state studiate solo le emissioni non–cretesi che ammontano a cinquantacinque monete d'argento a cui vanno aggiunti altri sei esemplari provenienti da Cirene. Questi ultimi ufficialmente appartengono ad un tesoretto rinvenuto nel 1935 a Hierapytna (*IGCH* 318), ma molto probabilmente fanno parte del nostro ripostiglio, e sono attualmente conservati insieme ad esso presso il Museo Numismatico di Atene.

Unitamente al catalogo numismatico si è fornito un breve commento relativo alle singole emissioni monetali, nel tentativo di contestualizzare le serie e di chiarirne la cronologia assoluta e relativa. Particolare attenzione è stata riservata alla monetazione cirenea nel tentativo di motivarne la presenza nell'isola di Creta, alla luce dei rapporti economici e commerciali testimoniatrici dalle scarse fonti storiche. Per tali serie si è

sostenuta una cronologia «bassa» (300/290–280 a.C.) e si è proposto di identificarne lo standard ponderale con la fase intermedia del peso tolemaico adottato dal 310 a.C., probabilmente in concomitanza con un cambiamento della *ratio* tra oro e argento.

I «pegasi» provengono sia da Corinto che dalle sue colonie (Anactorion, Amphiloichian Argos, Thyrrheion) e presentano simboli e monogrammi differenti, ma cronologicamente appartengono tutti al V periodo Ravel (387–306 a.C.).

Delle emissioni argive, scarsamente studiate, si è presentata la classificazione e si è proposta una cronologia molto ampia, dovendo necessariamente appartenere al periodo precedente l'ingresso della città nella Lega Achea.

David Jordan, Ψήγματα κριτικής, 4–10 [συνέχεια του άρθρου «Ψήγματα κριτικής», *Ευλιμένη* 1 (2000), 127–131], *ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 2 (2001), 155–159

Critical Trifles, 4–10 [continuation of «Ψήγματα κριτικής», Eulimene 1 (2000) 127–31].

4. On the curse tablet *DTAud* 41 (Megarid, Roman imperial), at B 1/2 and 4 read [μυ]/ριώνυ[μο]ν and [σ]τρέφης respectively rather than the published [τ]/ριώνυ[μο]ν and [σ]/τρέφης.

5. On the curse tablet *DTAud* 42 (Megarid, Roman imperial), at B 8 read τ[ι]ούς άκραπόδων (for άκρο–) δακτύλους rather than the published ...]ους άκρα ποδών δακτύλους.

6. On the gemstone Religions and cults in Pannonia. Exhibition at Székesfővár, Csók István Gallery, 15 May–30 September 1996 (Székesfővár 1998), no. 240 (Pannonia, III A.D.), read the personal name Φιλοσέραπιν Ἀγάθωνα rather than the published ΦΙΛΟΣΕΡΑΠΙΝΑΓΑΘΜΝΑ.

7. On the silver phylactery *BullMusComRoma n.s.* 13 (1999) 18–30 (Rome, IV/V A.D.), in line 1 read Πρὸς σεληνιαζομένους rather than the published Πρὸς σελ[ή]νην παξομένους.

8. On the papyrus phylactery *P.Oxy.* VII 1058 = *PGM* 6b (IV/V A.D.) read δὸ/τ[ρι]λον rather than the published δο/ῦλον in lines 3/4. The ὁ κατ[ο]ρ[ι] (ὁ καλ[] *edd.*) in line 6 is no doubt from the beginning of LXX *Ps.* 90.1: Ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ ὑψίστου ἐν σκέπη τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀλίσθησεται.

9. The ἐν της ταρταρης in lines 8/9 of the formulary *P.Carlsberg inv.* 52 (31) (VII A.D.; *Magica varia* 1) should be normalized ἐν τοῖς Ταρτάροις rather than ἐν τῆς Ταρτάρου as published.

10. On the parchment amulet *P.Louvre inv.* 7332 *bis* (VII A.D.; *Magica varia* 2 = *SB XVIII* 13602) at line 13 read τῆ[α]ς τεγούσης (for τεκούσης) (*e.g.*) Μ[[ητρὸς] Θ[ε]οῦ]] rather than the published τῆς' δετετουσης μ[.....] 1.

A. Agelarakis, On the Clazomenian quest in Thrace during the 7th and 6th centuries BC, as revealed through Anthropological Archaeology, *ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 2 (2001), 161–186

Περί του Κλαζομενιακού αποικισμού στη Θράκη τον 7^ο και 6^ο αιώνα π.Χ., μέσω της Ανθρωπολογικής Αρχαιολογίας. Παρουσιάζονται τα αρχαιο-ανθρωπολογικά δεδομένα που βασίζονται στη μελέτη του ανθρώπινου σκελετικού υλικού από ανασκαφές στο αρχαϊκό νεκροταφείο των Κλαζομενίων, του ανασκαφικού τομέα «Κ» στα Άβδηρα. Τα δημογραφικά και επιδημιολογικά στοιχεία αυτού του δείγματος του πληθυσμού, όπως

υποστηρίζονται από την ταφονομική, αρχαιομετρική, φυσική ανθρωπολογική και παλαιοπαθολογική έρευνα, παρέχουν σημαντικότερα αποτελέσματα στον χώρο της Ανθρωπολογικής Αρχαιολογίας, συμβάλλοντας, σε συνδυασμό με τις καθαρά αρχαιολογικές και σωζόμενες ιστορικές πηγές, στη διαλεύκανση πολλών ερωτημάτων σχετικά για τις εμπειρίες των Κλαζομενίων αποικιστών στη Θράκη και προσφέροντας παράλληλα ένα γόνιμο πεδίο για περαιτέρω προβληματισμό και ερμηνείες όσον αφορά τα αρχαϊκά χρόνια στα Άβδηρα.

C. Bourbou, Infant mortality: the complexity of it all!, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 2 (2001), 187–203

Παιδική θνησιμότητα: Μια πολύπλοκη υπόθεση. Η αρχαιολογική και ανθρωπολογική έρευνα μέχρι σήμερα δεν έχει στρέψει το ενδιαφέρον της στη μελέτη των παιδικών ταφών. Παρόλα ταύτα, οι ταφές των ανήλικων ατόμων μπορούν να προσφέρουν πολύτιμες πληροφορίες για τη σύνθεση της εικόνας των παλαιότερων κοινωνιών, καθώς τόσο το ποσοστό της παιδικής θνησιμότητας σε κάθε πληθυσμό όσο και οι διάφορες ασθένειες αποτελούν σημαντικές μαρτυρίες για το βιοτικό του επίπεδο. Τα παιδιά, πέρα από τη βιολογική τους υπόσταση προσδιορίζονται και μέσα από το πολιτιστικό πλαίσιο που ορίζει ο κάθε κοινωνικός ιστός. Έτσι, η συμπεριφορά των ενηλίκων απέναντι στα παιδιά είναι διαφορετική, ακόμα και στις περιπτώσεις του θανάτου ή της ταφής τους. Το θέμα της παιδοκτονίας (μέσα στους κόλπους της οικογένειας ή ως θυσία–προσφορά στους θεούς) έχει απασχολήσει περισσότερο τους ερευνητές, ιδιαίτερα στην προσπάθειά τους να αναγνωρίσουν τέτοιες περιπτώσεις από τα αρχαιολογικά και ανθρωπολογικά κατάλοιπα. Στην εργασία αυτή, παράλληλα με το θέμα της ταφονομίας (παράγοντες διατήρησης ή μη των παιδικών οστών) και της παιδοκτονίας στην αρχαιότητα, επικεντρώνουμε το ενδιαφέρον μας στην παιδική θνησιμότητα σε θέσεις της πρωτοβυζαντινής περιόδου (Ελεύθερνα, Γόρτυνα, Κνωσός, Κόρινθος, Μεσσήνη, Αλική). Η πρωτοβυζαντινή περίοδος παρουσιάζει ξεχωριστό ενδιαφέρον καθώς αποτελεί μία αρκετά «ταραγμένη» περίοδο της ύστερης αρχαιότητας για την οποία ελάχιστα μας είναι γνωστά. Η μελέτη των παιδικών ταφών από τις παραπάνω θέσεις μας έδωσε πολύτιμα στοιχεία για τα ποσοστά της παιδικής θνησιμότητας (υψηλότερα μετά τη γέννηση σε κάποιες θέσεις) αλλά και διάφορες μεταβολικές κυρίως ασθένειες (cribra orbitalia, Harris lines, έλλειψη βιταμίνης C).

ATTITUDES TO THE VISUAL ARTS OF CLASSICAL GREECE IN LATE ANTIQUITY¹

The aim of this article is to outline a few important changes in the general conception of the visual arts of classical Greece, changes which came to a head during late antiquity.²

The basic idea of ancient art which became gradually accepted in the period from the Severan dynasty until the definitive establishment of the *civitas Christiana* appears to me, as I will demonstrate below, to have been both idealistic and hedonistic. This approach therefore constituted the background to future classicistic and neo-classical revival within the western world, based on similar interpretations of the classical world.

Moreover, it seems to me that the original and creative re-interpretations of the artistic heritage of classical Greece that emerged in late antiquity have not yet been fully recognised, and this observation hopefully justifies this present study of the issue.

1. The concept of the visual arts as based on *phantasia* rather than *mimesis* in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* by Flavius Philostratus.

The elaboration of an idealistic conception of the visual arts, freed from the primary foundation of *mimesis*, is notoriously first expressed in this book, written for the empress Julia Domna, but completed after her death in 217.³ The *locus classicus* where

¹ I have lectured on this subject at the University of Tbilisi (Georgia), Faculty of Philosophy, Institutes of Ancient History and of Classical Studies, from 26/10 to 5/11, 1999.

² Good and recent syntheses on late antiquity can be found in G.W. Bowersock, P. Brown and O. Grabar, *Late Antiquity: a Guide to the post-classical World* (Cambridge 1999) and M. Maas, *Readings in late-Antiquity: a Sourcebook* (London 2000). I have anticipated at length several of the studies and assertions presented here in my following two books: *Prassitele. Fonti epigrafiche e letterarie. Vita e opere. 2. Fonti letterarie tardoantiche* (Rome 1990) and *3. Fonti letterarie bizantine* (Rome 1992); the essential earlier bibliography on this topic is cited in these two publications. Moreover, very interesting articles on the subject can also be found in *Bild- und Formensprache der spaetantiken Kunst. Hugo Brandenburg zum 65. Geburtstag, Boreas* (17, 1994): see especially C. Gnilka, «Prudentius ueber das Templum Romae und seine Statuen (Prud. c. Symm. 1.215 (237))», 65–88 and T. Pekary, «Plotin und die Ablehnung des Bildnisses in der Antike», 177–86. On the approach of late antiquity towards classical Greek sculptural types with mythological subjects, see M. Bergmann, *Chiragan, Aphrodisias, Konstantinopel: zur mythologischen Skulptur der Spaetantike* (Wiesbaden 1999). On individual aspects of the questions considered in this article, see the bibliography in the notes below.

³ On the changing concept of *phantasia* in early and middle imperial philosophy and on its promotion by successive generations of Platonic thinkers, see G. Watson, *Phantasia in classical Thought* (Galway 1988) and *idem*, «The Concept of 'Phantasia' from the Late Hellenistic Period to Early Neo-Platonism», *ANRW* (36.7, 1994) 4765–810. On Philostratus and his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, the bibliography is extensive. I cite here only: G. Anderson, *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century AD* (Croom Helm 1986); E. Koskeniemi, *Der Philostratische Apollonios* (Helsinki 1991) and J.-J. Flinterman, *Power, Paideia and Pythagoreanism: Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs and Political Ideas in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius* (Amsterdam 1995). On the problematic reconstruction of the genealogical tree of the family of Philostrati, see L. de Lennoy, «Le problème des Philostrates», *ANRW* (34.3, 1997) 2362–449.

this new idea is asserted very clearly is 6.19. The episode evoked in this passage is a dialogue between Apollonius and the naked sages of Egypt, which was said to have taken place during the reign of Vespasian:

«Apollonius said: ‘It is about the gods that I would like to ask you a question first, namely, what induced you to impart, as your tradition, to the people of this country forms of the gods that are absurd and grotesque in all but a few cases? In a few cases, do I say? I would rather say that in very few are the gods’ images fashioned in a wise and god-like manner (*sophos kai theoeidos*), for the mass of your shrines seem to have been erected in honour rather of irrational and ignoble animals than of gods.’ Thespision, resenting these remarks, said: ‘And your own images in Greece, how are they fashioned?’ ‘In the way’ he replied, ‘in which it is best and most reverent (*hos... kalliston te kai theophilestaton*) to construct images of the gods.’ ‘I suppose you allude,’ said the other, ‘to the statue of Zeus in Olympia, and to the image of Athena and to that of the Cnidian goddess and to that of the Argive goddess and to other images equally beautiful and full of charm.’ ‘Not only to these,’ replied Apollonius, ‘but without exception I maintain, that whereas in other lands statuary (*agalmatopoiia*) has scrupulously observed decency and fitness, you rather make ridicule of the divine (*theion*) than really believe in it.’ ‘Your artists, then, like Phidias’, said the other, ‘and like Praxiteles went up, I suppose, to heaven and took a copy of the forms of the gods, and then reproduced these by their art, or was there any other influence which presided over and guided their moulding?’ ‘There was,’ said Apollonius, ‘and an influence pregnant with wisdom (*meston ge sophias*) and genius.’ ‘What was that?’ said the other, ‘for I do not think, you can adduce any except imitation (*mimesis*).’ ‘Imagination (*phantasia*)’, said Apollonius, ‘wrought these works, a wiser (*sophotera*) and subtler artist by far than imitation; for imitation can only create as its handiwork what it has seen (*demiourgesei ho eiden*), but imagination equally what it has not seen; for it will conceive (*hypotheseitai*) of its ideal with reference to the Being (*pros then anaphoran tou ontos*), and imitation is often baffled by terror, but imagination by nothing; for it marches undismayed (*anekplektos*) to the goal which it has itself laid down.’» (transl. Loeb, with some amendments).

Apollonius explains that the «art of making divine statues» (*agalmatopoiia*) creates figures full of wisdom (*sophia*), divine-like (*theoeideia*), liveliness (*meston*: full, pregnant, vibrating, thus animated) and of the highest level of beauty and divine inspiration (*hos kalliston te kai theophilestaton*).

The medium, or way, to reach this target is constituted by *phantasia* (imagination), which goes beyond *mimesis* (imitation), although this latter type of approach is indispensable at the level of the creation of what has been seen (*demiourgesei ho eiden*).

On Apollonius from Tyana, whose most important period of activity is dated from Nero to Domitian, see F. Grosso, «La vita di Apollonio di Tiana come fonte storica», *Acme* (7, 1954) 333–52; E. Lyall Bowie, «Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality», *ANRW* (16.2, 1978) 1652–99; and M. Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History* (Rome 1986). It is debatable as to whether Philostratus recreated episodes taken from the real life of Apollonius or invented at least most of them. I incline to believe the first opinion rather than the second. For example, Philostratus, *Life* 6.40, informs us that Apollonius put an end to the love of men for statues of naked goddesses in the age of Domitian. The fact that there is indeed no evidence of men’s love for statues after Domitian suggests that Apollonius’ opposition to this phenomenon was real and not just an invention of Philostratus.

The phase of imitation may be achieved through the use of earthly suggestions that excite a worthy definition of the deity⁴ and, of course, with the translation of this idea into something material. In fact, imagination places divine images (*theon eide*) as archetypes or ideas or assumptions (*hypotheseis*), pre-figured through a relationship with Being (*pros ten anaphoran tou ontos*). *Anaphora* expresses the concepts of elevation, and *ascesis*, of the imagination towards the Being, of the relationship with and dependence upon the Being and of repetition and re-proposition, as far as it is possible, of the same Being, that is, of the archetype in this case. Dependence upon the Being ensures the imagination is undismayed (*anekplektos*), i.e. cannot be undermined by sensible experience, in tending toward the truth, both ideal and divine. As a mimetical activity *agalmatopoiia* is deceptive and limited to what can be experienced by the senses, but as an imaginative activity it is wise because it promotes a better knowledge of the divine (*theion*).

The concept of an *agalmatopoiia* which overcomes mimesis originated in the need, of Platonic origin,⁵ that the sculptor does not 'copy' his image from the realm of sensible experience, but takes it directly from the divine archetype, via traces of memory, as his soul was aware of the divine archetypes before it became part of the life of his body.⁶ The result of this process may be a divine image which is thus wise, close to its deity and lively. This is in keeping with Plato's predilection for statues to be conceived as living organisms, when compared with statues imitating seeming reality. The terminology used by Philostratus is also in the Platonic tradition: the words *theoeides*, *mestos*, *theion* and especially *hypothesis* refer to important and specific concepts of Plato's philosophy.⁷

An original re-elaboration from these premises is constituted by *phantasia* which works now as a medium between «artist» and «archetype». *Phantasia* is here regarded as creative imagination. It constitutes the main function which presides over artistic creations for the first time, as far as I know, in Longinus' *Peri hypsous*, of early imperial Roman date.⁸ In Plato, *phantasia* has the meaning of appearance, or imagination as the

⁴ The idea that the process of knowing the divine resembles climbing a ladder and that the lower rungs of this ladder are constituted by the experience of the less imperfect earthly examples, is Platonic; see Plato, *Symposium* 210e – 211c.

⁵ On Plato and the visual arts, see M. Andronikos, *O Platon kai he techne; oi Platonikes apopseis gia to horaio kai tis eikastikes technes* (Thessalonike 1952); P.-M. Schuhl, *Platon et l'art de son temps (arts plastiques)* (Paris 1952); R.C. Lodge, *Plato's Theory of Art* (London 1953); B. Schweitzer, *Platon und die bildende Kunst der Griechen* (Tuebingen 1953); M. Verdenius, *Mimesis: Plato's Doctrine of Artistic Imitation, and its Meaning to Us* (Leiden 1963); G. Cambiano, *Platone e le tecniche* (Turin 1971); I. Murdoch, *The Fire and the Sun: why Plato banished the Artists* (Oxford 1977); E.C. Keuls, *Plato and Greek Painting* (Leiden 1978); C. Janaway, *Images of Excellence: Plato's Critique of the Arts* (Oxford 1995); D. Roochnik, *Of Art and Wisdom: Plato's Understanding of Techne* (University Park, Pennsylvania, 1996) and S. Halliwell, «Plato and Painting», in N.K. Rutter and B.A. Sparkes (eds), *Word and Image in ancient Greece* (Edinburgh 2000) 99–116.

⁶ Two epigrams attributed to Plato the Philosopher (*Anthologia Graeca* 16.160–1) express this need very clearly; see my article «Small Nuggets about late-Classical Sculpture», *NumAntCl* (29, 2000) 150–1.

⁷ The relevant passages in the *Corpus Platonicum* can be found in L. Brandwood, *A Word Index to Plato* (Leeds 1976) 445–6 (*s.v. theios*); 446 (*s.v. theoeides*); 569 (*s.v. mestos*); and 921 (*s.v. hypothesis*).

⁸ 3.1; 7.1; 9.13; especially 15; and 43.3.

re-presentation of appearing images, derived from sensible reality, but does not yet mean a fantastical creativity, freed from imitation of what appears.⁹

In Aristotle, this word refers to the power of imagining, both mental and representational of images obtained through the senses; it is not yet a demiouрге of wise works.¹⁰ The later meaning of *phantasia* becomes established with Longinus' *Peri hypsous* and with Philostratus' *Apollonius*¹¹ in early Roman Imperial times. An antecedent of the concept of *phantasia* as creative imagination, conceived as the main force which leads to artistic creation, is found in the belief of *phantasia* as the perceptive power to see what cannot be perceived by the senses alone, an idea attributable to Stoicism as early as the first century BC.¹²

The explanation therefore of this creative power of *phantasia* with its relationship to Being pertains probably to this early-imperial idea. Indeed, the dependence of *phantasia* upon Being is expressed by the word *anaphora* several times in early-imperial literature.¹³

It is thus possible that the attribution of a creative function to *phantasia* as opposed to mimesis and the explanation of the power of *phantasia* through its relationship with Being constitute an early imperial revision, in the period of the *Peri hypsous*, of the earlier Platonic conception. As such, the critical substance of Apollonius' speech to the naked sages of Egypt must really be traced to the thinker of Tyana.¹⁴ Apollonius is thus likely to have re-meditated the traditional interpretation of *agalmatopoiia* in a cognitive way. Philostratus has probably emphasised, and transformed into his own, the conception of *agalmatopoiia* as a fantastical and wise activity, as it satisfies his needs for mystical and transcendental explanations of the creativity and beauty existing in the world, something which is typical of the cultural world of Julia Domna.¹⁵

The task of creating wise works as performed by *agalmatopoiia* is exemplified by Philostratus with the names of the two most famous *agalmatopoiioi*, with long traditions: Phidias and Praxiteles.¹⁶

⁹ The relevant passages can be found in Brandwood (n. 7) 933 (*s.vv. phantazesthai; phantasia; phantaseos; phantasma; and phantastiken*).

¹⁰ The relevant passages can be found in H. Bonite, *Index Aristotelicus* (Berlin 1961²) 811–2, *s.vv. phantazesthai; phantasia; phantasma and phantastikos*.

¹¹ Quintilian seems also to share Longinus' notion of *phantasia* (evidence and discussion in Watson, «The Concept, etc.» (n. 3), 4774–7).

¹² Posidonius is credited with having developed this notion of *phantasia*, on the grounds of Cicero's *Orator* 8–10, which is thought to have been influenced by Posidonius: see E. La Rocca, *L'esperienza della perfezione* (Milan 1988) 35, n. 90, with earlier bibliography.

¹³ Evidence in *LSJ*, *s.v. anaphora* ii, 1: «reference of a thing to a standard.»

¹⁴ This conclusion seems in keeping with Grosso's study (n. 3): this scholar has ascertained that many of the details in Philostratus' *Life* are reliable and in fact refer to early imperial culture and the historical conditions of that age.

¹⁵ See especially Watson, «The Concept, etc.» (n. 3) and Anderson (n. 3).

¹⁶ See e.g., Phryne, in Athenaeus 13.585f; Spartiatas, *Oratio ad Lacedaemones: Choricus, Declamationes* 8.40; Laterculi Alexandrini 7.3–4; Hermodorus, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.170; 169; Diodorus 26.1.1; Propertius 3.9.15–6; Priapea 10.2–3; Columella 1. *praefatio* 31; Statius, *Silvae* 4.6.26–7; Martial 4.39.3–4; Lucian, *De sacrificiis* 11; *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit* 51; *Imagines* 6; *Pro imaginibus* 23; Gallus 24; Galenus, *De naturabilibus facultatibus* 2.3.35, 82; Athenagoras 17.4; Clement, *Protrepticus* 4.47 and 10.78; Himerius, *Orationes* 64.4; Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio* 3.71.49; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina* 23.504–6; Procopius, *De aedificiis* 1.11.7; Photius, *Homelias* 10.2.433; Arethas, *Scholia to Clement, Protrepticus* 4.47; Cedrenus 322b–

This reference to them seems particularly indebted to the judgement that their activity matched the conception of *agalmatopoiia* asserted by Apollonius. In fact, Plato had already expressed approval of Phidias as a creator of works echoing absolute beauty.¹⁷ As such, within the Second Sophistic culture of the Flavian/Trajanic age Phidias was considered to be a wise man who, thanks to his speculative knowledge and through his sculpture, had improved man's knowledge of the gods.¹⁸ Praxiteles, on the other hand, having been close to the Platonic circle,¹⁹ must have fully established the requirement to shape the forms of idols from the true forms of the gods, going beyond basic imitation.

The passage of Philostratus shows that Platonism had slowly paved the way for the prevalence not of a mimetic but of a transcendental and idealistic interpretation of the creation of idols, which was in keeping with the emerging metaphysical conception of beauty.²⁰

The spiritual climate of the age did not immediately lead to a deliberately anti-classical attitude nor to any decline in enthusiasm towards the great masters of the fifth and fourth centuries BC.

On the contrary, these masters are regarded by Philostratus' Apollonius as the main representatives of idealistic and non-mimetic visual arts. In the same way, their reception was updated and adjusted to contemporary philosophical and aesthetic trends.

However, this 'modernisation' of the classical Greek visual arts did not last for long, and awareness of the distance of the ancient arts from the new aesthetic ideals was destined very soon to become a predominant idea.

2. The magical conception of ancient works of art in Callistratus' *de statu*s

Callistratus was a Second Sophistic writer who wrote 14 accounts of works of art:²¹ one painting (no. 14) and 13 *agalmata* (nos. 1–13). Eight of these 13 statues were in marble (nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13) and five in bronze (nos. 3, 6, 7, 8, 11). Nine works are described without the name of their creators being given (nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14), while the names of the masters of five of the statues are given; these were Scopas (no. 2), Praxiteles (nos. 3, 8 and 11) and Lysippus (no. 6).

The subjects represented are symbols of the sensual and instinctive life, such as love, inebriation, excitement for music, madness or persons subjected to these conditions or feelings (nos. 1–5 and 7–11), and in one case the personification of an abstract concept (no. 6). No. 9 is an Egyptian dynastic period statue, nos. 1, 4 and 5 appear to be

c; Manasses, *Descriptio imaginum* 1.75; Tzetzes, *Epistulae* 42; *Codex Vaticanus Graecus* 989, *ult. fol.*, 110; Georgius Acropolites, *Chronica* 50.103b.

¹⁷ See Plato, *Hippias maior* 290a–d; *Protagoras* 311c–e; and *Meno* 91d.

¹⁸ See especially the *Olympian Oration* by Dio Chrysostomus: G.A. Cellini, «La fortuna dello Zeus di Fidia: considerazioni intorno al logos Olympikos di Dione Crisostomo», *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* (19, 1995) 101–32.

¹⁹ See my article cited at n. 6.

²⁰ See, first of all, the seminal work by J. Dillon, *The middle Platonists* (London 1977), especially 184–383; also, H. Doerrie and M. Baltes, *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus* (Stuttgart 1993).

²¹ On Callistratus, see S. Altekamp, «Zu den Statuenbeschreibungen des Kallistratus», *Boreas* (11, 1988) 77–154 and my book *Praxiteles* 2 (n. 2) 95–139.

Hellenistic, whilst the others are, or may be, late classical. According to Callistratus, these works were to be found at: Thebes in Egypt (no. 1); also near Thebes, but located more generically in Ethiopia (no. 9); at Sicyon (no. 6); in the *Museum* on Mt. Helicon (no. 7); no. 5 was also located in a *Museum*, probably also that on Helicon, as it represented Narcissus from Thespieae near the sanctuary, and this was the most important sanctuary of the Muses; 13 was in Macedonia, perhaps at Pella, and 14 on the shores of Scythia, perhaps at Tomis. In other cases, the presence of the works of art described at Athens is clearly noted: one stood on the Acropolis (no. 11) and another in the Propylaea (no. 12).

Callistratus therefore seems to specify the centre where the work stood only when it was not Athens, and those whose settings are not given stood at Athens (nos. 2, 3, 4, 8, 10).

Callistratus did not specify when the works of art were located in Athens, most probably because he lived in that city and was addressing other learned Athenian residents who were aware of the main works of art standing in their city.

At 5.5, he addresses his public as *neoi*, young people: He may thus have been a school-teacher, initially writing for his own pupils.

An important question concerns what Callistratus actually knew about the works that he describes. Wolters' thesis²² that Callistratus invents the works that he discusses is not convincing.²³ Indeed, six statues described by Callistratus are also known through other surviving sources.²⁴ Moreover, one of these statues —the northerly of the two colossal seating statues created by the Egyptian Pharaoh Amenhotep III on the left bank of the Nile at Thebes in Egypt, which was interpreted by the Greeks as a statue of Memnon and described by Callistratus as no. 9— still survives today.²⁵ Finally, Callistratus notes in several cases where these creations stood and attributes to them styles which can be easily equated with those of specific periods. These observations prove that these works existed, because the rhetor could not know the iconographic

²² P. Wolters, «Die Eroten des Praxiteles», *AZ* (43, 1885) 82–98.

²³ I am equally not convinced by the thesis asserted by N. Bryson, «Philostratus and the imaginary Museum», S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds), *Art and Text in ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge 1994) 255–83 and 312–4, that the pictures described by Philostratus the Elder in his *Imagines* and which are said by the writer to have been displayed in an art gallery near Naples, are simply literary fiction, argued mainly on the grounds that most of Philostratus' phrasing depends very heavily on the earlier rhetorical tradition of *ekphrasis*. This kind of argument is blatantly illogical. Anecdotal experience can further enlighten on this issue. One day, I accompanied a couple of friends to see the statues of the Ludovisi Collection in Rome and recited in front of each of these sculptures a poem taken from Italian classicist literature appropriate to the subject represented by that sculpture. I did not compose any of these poetical accounts myself, but nevertheless the sculptures of the Ludovisi Collection existed. So, the existence of the paintings illustrated by Philostratus does not seem undermined by his echoing of previous descriptions.

²⁴ Callistratus describes the following statues known through other sources: a) the Maenad by Scopas (description no. 2; see also *Anthologia Graeca* 9.774; 16.57; 58; and 60); b) the Kairos by Lysippus (description no. 6; see also the many other testimonia collected by P. Moreno, *Lisippo* (Bari 1974), nos. 2; 5–6; 12; 49; 92–3; 95; 100; 119; 127–9; 131; 133; 135; 137–9; 145–6; 148; 153; and 157); c) the Orpheus in the sanctuary of the Muses on the Helicon (description no. 7; see also Pausanias 9.30.4–12); d) Praxiteles' Dionysus (description no. 8; see also Pliny 34.69); e) the statue of Memnon (description no. 9; for the many sources, especially epigraphic, A. and E. Bernard, *Les inscriptions Grecques et Latines du Colosse de Memnon* (Cairo 1960); L. Guerrini, «Memnon, colossi di», *EAA* (4, 1961) 997–9; and A. Kossatz-Deissmann, «Memnon», *LIMC* (6, 1992) 459, no. 94); and f) the statue of a Centaur (description no. 12; see also *Anthologia Graeca* 16.115–6).

²⁵ See n. 24.

histories of the various subjects portrayed and, if he had invented the statues, he would inevitably have attributed to his invented representations configurations without stylistical coherence and which do not reflect specific stylistic periods. Having established that Callistratus describes works of art which really existed, we should consider whether he actually saw these works or if he took his information from earlier sources only. His descriptions often imply that he himself had viewed the monuments that he describes.²⁶ The statue of Medea (no. 13) must have actually existed and is unlikely to be the result of a misunderstanding of the sources describing the famous picture of Medea made by Timomachus.²⁷ As for Lysippus' Kairos, Moreno has demonstrated that there was agreement among the several writers on the iconography of the statue.²⁸ Callistratus (6.1) locates this statues at Sicyon, although in three passages (*Epistulae* 70 and *Historiae* 8.200.421–7 and 10.322.257–67) Tzetzes tells us that the Kairos had been presented by Lysippus to Alexander the Great. Posidippus (*Anthologia Graeca* 16.275), in as early as the early third century BC, seems to refer to this statue as being set up at the entrance of a palace (probably the Royal Palace at Pella). This inconsistency may be explained by the following reconstruction of the history of the statue: a) Lysippus presented the statue to Alexander; b) it was therefore set up at the royal palace of the Macedonian kings at Pella; and c) a successor of Alexander, wishing to honour the city in which Alexander's beloved sculptor was born, presented Sicyon with this statue, in keeping with the pro-Macedonian policy of this city prior to 251 BC.²⁹

The reason that Callistratus eulogises these works of art in his accounts and the fact that he praises all the masterpieces for the same reason (because they reveal life and animation thanks to the power of the visual arts) is not because, as some might argue, he did not actually see these creations and thus described them only generically. Rather, he evaluates these works of art on the basis of the sense of life that they exude as this is more interesting to him than the particular form of each work. In other words, it is the magical and super-natural substance of a work of art that matters. This conception is the antecedent of the attribution of supernatural power to icons in Byzantine culture. In any case, Callistratus does not simply focus on the magical power of all 14 representations, but he also suggests the different ways in which this target was reached for each work. For example, when he describes the statues of Praxiteles (nos. 3, 8, 11), he insists on the sculptor's ability to inject feelings into his statues. When he describes Scopas' Maenad, he refers to the expression of movement and the immersion of the figure in the atmosphere.

²⁶ See 1.3 and 5; 2.2–3 and 4; 3.2 and 5; 4.4; 5.2 and 4; 6.1 and 3–4; 7.1 and 4; 8.4; 10.2; 11.1; 12.1; 13.1 and 3; 14.1–2. Only the description of the statue of «Memnon» (no. 9) does not have allusions to the view of the statue by the writer.

²⁷ This picture was very famous especially in the first and second centuries A.D.: see the sources collected by J. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildende Kuenste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig 1868) 407–10, nos. 2119–24 and 2127–36 and the critical evaluation by P. Moreno, «Timomachos», *EAA* (7, 1966) 860–1.

²⁸ See P. Moreno, «Kairos», *LIMC* (5, 1990) 920–6, nos. 1–5, with fig. 1.

²⁹ See, for this explanation, my *Prassitele* (...) 3 (n. 2) 198–9, n. 2573. On the pro-Macedonian policy of Sicyon in the early Hellenistic period, see G. Shipley, *The Greek World after Alexander* (London 2000) 121–2 and 137. This statue was removed from Sicyon in the late fourth century A.D. and taken to Constantinople, where it was burnt in the fire of 476 A.D. (see S. Guberti Bassett, «Excellent Offerings»: the Lausus Collection in Constantinople», *The Art Bulletin* (82, 1, 2000) 6–25).

As regards the Kairos by Lysippus, he places emphasis on the provisional configuration of the statue and on its allegorical meaning, thanks to which the statue retained the power of the deity. This Second Sophistic writer thus reveals an understanding of the most important features of the works that he describes, and also interprets these works with a typically late-antique taste, appreciating the changes of colour on the surfaces of the sculptures, the allegorical interpretations and the magical aspects of the works. He thus most definitely seems to have seen the works that he describes.

The following considerations are also note-worthy:

1. His descriptions of works of art that were set up at Athens, Sicyon, on Mt. Helicon, in Macedonia, at Egyptian Thebes as well as in Scythia, and the likelihood that he actually saw them lead to the conclusion that he made journeys probably from Athens to all the regions where these works stood. This consideration implies that Callistratus lived in a period when art-tourism was widespread: in 6.4, he mentions a professional guide who had explained Lysippus' Kairos to him. As his accounts of the statues could not have been written before the accounts of paintings (*Imagines*) by Philostratus Major (most probably the same author as that of the *Life of Apollonius from Tyana*, who flourished about 200 AD.³⁰), and he also mentions that pagan sanctuaries were still open, thus indicating a period before Theodosius, the most likely date for the composition of the *De statuīs* is between 190 and 380. Art tourism flourished in the Severan period, although obviously declining during the period of military anarchy which followed, resuming again during the middle decades of the fourth century AD.³¹

Callistratus wrote that the statue of Memnon at Thebes in Egypt made noises. This phenomenon is very well evidenced for all the early period of the Roman Empire until the beginning of the third century, after which the noises ceased, most probably after the restoration of the monument in *ca.* 205.³² This suggests that the earliest possible date is more correct for Callistratus. This neo-sophist was probably close to Flavius Philostratus, the writer of the *Life of Apollonius* and of the earlier *Eikones*, and this explains why his *Descriptions of statues* is close to Philostratus' *Descriptions of Paintings*.

2. Callistratus in fact expresses the typical Attic culture of this period, and is highly influenced by Euripides and Demosthenes.³³

³⁰ See de Lennoy (n. 3). The identification of the Philostratus who wrote the *Life of Apollonius* with the Philostratus who wrote the earlier *Imagines* is asserted clearly by Suidas, *phi* 421, *s.v.* Philostratos.

³¹ References to art tourism can be found in the context of the literature of the Severan age, in e.g. Aelian, *Varia historia* 9.32; Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii Tyanensis* 6.19 and 40 and *Imagines*; Clement, *Protrepticus ad Graecos* 4.47–54 and 10.78; Diogenes Laertius 6.2.60; Athenaeus 13.591a–c; Alciphron 4.1. frg. 3 and Ruphinus, *Anthologia Graeca* 5.14. The revival of art tourism in the middle decades of the fourth century AD is demonstrated by Himerius, *Orationes* 13.1; 48.14 ; 64.4 and 68.21; Libanius, *Declamationes* 25.40. R4.444; Iulian, *Orationes* 3 (2).4.68 H.54b, as well as by the epigrams of Ausonius describing works of art: see my commentary on most of these references in *Prassitele* (...) 2 (n. 2). On art tourism in the Roman empire, see R. Chevallier, *Voyages et déplacements dans l'empire Romain* (Paris 1988) 299–409; J.–M. Andre and M.–F. Baslez, *Voyager dans l'antiquité* (Lille 1993) 18–24; 40–2; 54–5; 58; 64–6; 74–6; 153–60; 180–9; 227–9; 247–60; 283–372; and L. Casson, *Travel in the ancient World* (Baltimore 1994) 229–99.

³² See bibliography *ad hoc* cited at n. 24. It seems likely that these noises were produced by the sudden expansion of the stone from heat, when the rays of the sun fell on it.

³³ See, for references to Euripides, 8.3 (*Bakchae*) and 13.3 (*Medea*); for a reference to Demosthenes, 2.5. On the fortune of the *Bakchae* in the period of Athenaeus and Clement, see J. Roux, *Euripide, Les Bacchantes*

3. He repeatedly asserts the notion that statues of gods and heroes are sacred images and earthly epiphanies of their divine subjects.³⁴ He focuses on their location in their own sacred places,³⁵ which suggests that he wrote during a period in which the pagan sanctuaries of Greece still flourished.

The insistence that these *agalmata* are epiphanies of the deities represented is probably a response to the criticism of earlier Christian writers that pagan idols were merely material and conventional, i.e. to Tatian's criticism in the *Oratio ad Graecos* 33.35–34.36, as well as that of Athenagoras in the *Legatio pro Christianis* 17.4–5, both of which had been written by the 170s, and perhaps also to Clement, who wrote between 200 and 203 (*Protrepticus ad Graecos* 4.47–54 and 10.78).

4. The probable composition of Callistratus' *De statu*s at Athens should be understood in the context of the flourishing of this city during the Severan period.³⁶ The fact that Callistratus is interested in *agalmata* much more than in paintings (13 of the 14 works are statues, whilst only one is a painting) may be due to the fact that the former were more likely to be interpreted as epiphanies of their subjects than paintings were, and were thus more important from a religious point of view.³⁷ Moreover, the greater

(Paris 1970) 75–6; on the fortune of the *Medea* in Roman middle-imperial times, D.L. Page, Euripides, *Medea* (Oxford 1967⁶) xii and lxxvi–lxxviii; see also F.L. Lucas, *Euripides and his Influence* (New York 1928) 75–81; on the fortune of Demosthenes in the period between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century AD, see C. Darwin Adams, *Demosthenes and his Influence* (New York 1927) 121–6.

³⁴ See especially 2.1: «It is not the art of poets and writers of prose alone that is inspired when divine power from the gods falls on their tongues, nay, the hands of sculptors also, when they are seized by the gift of a more divine inspiration, give utterance to creations that are possessed and full of madness. So Scopas, moved as it were by some inspiration, imparted to the production of this statue the divine frenzy within him (...). 2. (...) A statue of a Bacchante, wrought from Parian marble, has been transformed into a real Bacchante. (...) 3. (...) so clear an intimation was given of a Bacchante's divine possession stirring Bacchic frenzy (...). 5. Thus Scopas (...) was an artificer of truth and imprinted miracles on bodies.» 3.1: «My discourse desires to interpret another sacred work of art; for it is not right for me to refuse to call the productions of art sacred. The Eros, the workmanship of Praxiteles, was Eros himself, a boy in the bloom of youth with wings and bow. Bronze gave expression to him, and as though giving expression to Eros as a great and dominating god, it was itself subdued by Eros; for it could not endure to be just bronze, but it became Eros with all his greatness»; 10.2: «Art (...) after having portrayed the god in an image, it even passes over into the god himself. Matter though it is, it gives forth divine intelligence (...). 3. (...) the material (...) realizing that it represents a god and that he must work his own will» (transl. Loeb).

³⁵ See 1.1 and 5; 4.1; 5.1 and 5; 6.1; 7.1; 8.2; 9.1 and 3; 11.1; 12.1; 13.1 and 14.1.

³⁶ On the history and institutions of Athens in this period, see S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle* (Paris 1976) 21–367; from the economic point of view, not to be forgotten, J. Day, *An economic History of Athens under Roman Domination* (New York 1942) 177–261; for the importance of the «Library of Hadrian» in the institutional and cultural life of the period, see A. Karivieri, «The so-called Library of Hadrian and the Tetraconch Church in Athens», P. Castren (ed.), *Post-Herulian Athens* (Helsinki 1994) 89–113; on the flourishing of the production of sarcophaguses at Athens during this time, see A. Giuliano and B. Palma, *La maniera ateniese di età romana. I maestri dei sarcofagi attici* (Rome 1978) 27–57; on the flourishing of the production of sculpture during these years, see E. Lattanzi, *I ritratti dei cosmeti nel Museo Nazionale di Atene* (Rome 1968) 47–64 and 67–73; A. Natsoule–Staurida, *Rhomaika Portraita sto Ethniko Archaologiko Mouseio tes Athenas* (Athena 1985) 71–85 and 96–106; K. Rhomiopoulou, *Hellenorhomaika Glypta tou Ethnikou Archaologikou Mouseiou* (Athena 1997) 58–67 and 86–130 and Eadem, *National Archaeological Museum. Collection of Roman Sculpture* (Athens, *sine data*) 22–6; 30–5 and 70–9.

³⁷ The long tradition of cult statues no doubt involved the acceptance of the epiphany of the deity *sub specie statuæ*: see, for the concept of statues endowed with the life of their subjects, C.A. Faraone, *Talismans*

importance of sculpture over painting from a religious and philosophical perspective was derived from the philosophy of Plato himself, who conceived of the true, heavenly world as composed of colourless ideas.³⁸ This idea was gaining ground in the reign of Septimius Severus with the theory of the Philostratan Apollonius discussed above, that some exceptional statues are wise expressions of the deities represented, whose *ousia* is reached and known to a certain degree through *phantasia*.

More generally, the admiration expressed for the statues of the «ancient» masters, the emphasis given to the strong impact of their own works on the viewers and the consideration of these works as part of a conception of the divine that must be defended, are typical of many aspects of Second Sophistic culture.³⁹

So, our neo-sophist praises images thought to provide life and animation and that reveal the divine or heroic nature of these idols. His claim that representations of deities may be an earthly epiphany of their subjects, their being and power,⁴⁰ which is, as I said above, probably a veiled response to the criticism of the Christian apologists, is of course consistent with his consideration only of *agalmata* (with the exception of the one painting), as statues could be considered, more than painted figures, as real persons, imbued with life.

Callistratus even gives details of this proposed transformation of the statue, from an entirely material work to a kind of «container» of the god: the sculptor works as a magician, or as a *medium*, creating a statue which is appropriate to its deity and worthy of him, where the divine or heroic individual represented can thus go and dwell. This statue is thus transformed into the real subject represented.⁴¹

Callistratus believes that Daedalus was the *heures*, or inventor, of the power to attract the life of the person represented into the statue and that Daedalus' works had the power to move.⁴² The latter opinion was widespread from at least the fifth century BC.⁴³

However, he supplies the names of only three late-classical sculptors, Scopas, Praxiteles and Lysippus, as creators of the statues he describes. This fits in with a long tradition of art criticism (theorised probably by Xenocrates in the beginning of the third century BC and which became pre-eminent in early imperial times) that placed the peak of the visual arts in the late-classical period.⁴⁴ Nostalgia for the era of Middle and New

and Trojan Horses (New York 1992) and S. Morris, *Daedalus and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton 1992). I have tried to follow the gradual ripening and changes of this conception throughout the different periods of the Greek culture in my article «Ancient Greek Sculptors as Magicians», *NumAntiCl* (28, 1999) 97–111.

³⁸ See especially Phaedrus 247c and Epinomis 981b: *bibl. ad hoc* in n. 5.

³⁹ See especially the much earlier *Olympic Speech* of Dio Chrysostomus, on the sacral nature of the Zeus of Olympia, as a worthy representation of the real Zeus (n. 18). On the most diffused religious and philosophical opinions within Second Sophistic culture, see the useful synthesis of C. Moreschini, «Aspetti della cultura filosofica negli ambienti della seconda sofistica», *ANRW* (2.36.7, 1994) 5101–33.

⁴⁰ See n. 34 for the passages where this idea is asserted more clearly.

⁴¹ See the passages collected in n. 34.

⁴² See 3.5, 8.1 and 9.3.

⁴³ See the passages collected by Morris and myself (cited in n. 37).

⁴⁴ The opinion that late-classical artists constituted the peak of the Greek experience in visual arts seems to have been conceived probably first of all by some of the most important leading masters of this period: for example, a joke by Phryne, reported by Athenaeus 13.585f, implies that she admired the art of Praxiteles,

Comedy was typical of Severan culture, i.e. of the decades from Alciphron (*ca.* 190–200 AD) to Athenaeus (*ca.* 230 AD).⁴⁵ The emphasis given by Callistratus to fourth-century BC masters is thus understandable in this period.

According to Callistratus, these three masters had made *agalmata* provided even with a soul, brain, breath, the power to feel emotions and with a physical appearances in tune with such an internal life, forging thus creations which partake fully of life and of the internal qualities of the subjects represented. The representations of figures characterised by internal life, movement and immersion into space, were considered by Hellenistic art criticism to be the main feature of the art of the most important late-classical masters.⁴⁶ Moreover, the use of magic, and particularly of magical tools, in order to transform the material statue into the epiphany of the deity represented was especially attributed to Praxiteles by a tradition which was already ancient by this period.⁴⁷

From this perspective, Callistratus thus stuck to traditional interpretations of the late-classical visual arts.

However, the notion of statues as automata with a supernatural life and the interpretation of them in terms of miracles constitute a reinterpretation and updating of these Hellenistic evaluations. This was because images were now commonly considered as magic works, which contained the soul, features and power of the subject represented, an idea which was to become increasingly popular during late-antiquity.⁴⁸

who was her lover, more than that of Phidias. Moreover, Praxiteles, in the passages of his oration to the Spartans preserved by Choricus (*Declamationes* 8.19; 47; 57; 65–7 and 86), made it clear that he thought of himself as the best sculptor of *agalmata* to have ever existed. Apelles used to assert, according to Pliny 35.79–80, that he was unbeatable in the expression of *charis*. Finally, Lysippus' statement, collected by Duris (Pliny 34.61), that he preferred to follow nature than any past master is in keeping with the optimistic feeling that visual arts were at their zenith in this period. On the theorisation by Xenocrates of the preeminence of late-classical artists in the context of the development of visual arts in Greece, see B. Schweitzer, *Xenokrates von Athen* (Halle 1932). The popularity of this idea in early imperial times is demonstrated especially by Pliny 34.52–65 and 35.54–137, as well as by Quintilian 12.10.3–9 (see J. Pollitt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art* (New Haven 1974) 73–84 and J. Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society* (Odense 1998) 97–107 and 125–31).

⁴⁵ Concerning the date of Alciphron's *Letters*, as in the case of Callistratus, the fact that this Second Sophistic writer also mentions the noises produced by the statue of Memnon as a phenomenon which still continued in his days is again conclusive. This places his book earlier than the restoration of the Memnon in *ca.* 205 A.D. (see B. Balwin, «The Date of Alciphron», *Hermes* (110, 1982) 253–4). On Athenaeus, and the idealization of the New Comedy society mirrored in his work, see D. Braund and J. Wilkins (eds), *Athenaeus and his World: reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter 2000). The predilection for the late-classical culture distinguishes Severan culture from the Hadrianic and Antonine societies, characterised also by archaising trends which lead to an emphasis on the archaic and early classical periods, well exemplified especially by Pausanias and Athenagoras. The concern to adhere to the most traditional interpretation of visual arts, typical of Severan culture, may reveal an approach to the «ancient» world as a period that is now regarded as having ended and which should be therefore considered as having a peak, whilst the predilection for the archaic period which is typical of much of Antonine culture shows an interest in the beginning of a process that is felt as operating still in the present moment.

⁴⁶ See G. Schwarz, *Die Griechische Kunst des 5 and 4 Jahrhunderts v. Chr. in Spiegel der Anthologia Graeca* (Wien 1971).

⁴⁷ See Plato, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.160; Meleager, *ibidem* 12.57 and Ausonius, *Epigrammata* 62 Green.

⁴⁸ The development of this concept of images can be followed especially through the descriptions of the paintings by the Philostrati major and minor, the descriptions of works of art in the *Epigrammata* of Ausonius and, at the very end of this process, the considerations of ancient statues in the *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai* (see A. Cameron and J. Herrin (eds), *Constantinople in the early Eighth Century: the Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*

3. The condemnation of Greek works of art, thought to be material, immoral and inconsistent from a theological point of view, from Tatian, Athenagoras and Clement until Arnobius, Firmicus Maternus and Theodoretus from Cyrrha.⁴⁹

In order to define and understand the Church Fathers' concept of ancient Greek art, we must also recall the growing nostalgia towards masterpieces and monuments of the classical age that had characterised Second Sophistic culture, from Dio Chrysostomus to Athenaeus.⁵⁰ Especially from the second half of the second century AD, the works of the most important masters of the late-classical period were particularly idealised and their art interpreted through the mirror of New Comedy. Courtesans are regarded as emblematic figures of that earlier age and several famous works of art are interpreted as in keeping with their world and are thought to speak a language of seduction and pleasure. In other words, the period of ancient art that was considered the peak of the artistic process was interpreted in hedonistic terms.

Not surprisingly, figures of Aphrodite, Eros and of related subjects made by the famous masters become very popular, as did the masters who had created them, above all Praxiteles and Apelles. So, the Cnidian Aphrodite, the Eros from Thespieae, the Aphrodite/Phryne of Delphi and the Aphrodite Anadiomene became the beloved symbols of the lost beauty of Greece in its great and remote old days.⁵¹

When Christian writers became concerned with defining a Christian concept of ancient pagan works of arts, i.e. during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, it was inevitable that they considered the Second Sophistic interpretation of them in hedonistic terms to be normal.⁵² So, the classical visual arts were regarded by Christians too as seductive products, symbolised by the figures of Aphrodite, Eros, mythical lovers and courtesans, and were thought to have been made in order to exalt sexual love and a world of pleasure.

(Leiden 1984) 27–8; 31–4; and 45–53). Of course, the parallel establishment of attributions of magical powers to Christian icons is another aspect of the same process: see R. Cormack, *Writing in Gold. Byzantine Society and its Icons* (London 1985).

⁴⁹ The Church Fathers' idea of Greek art was the object of an unpublished paper I gave at conference of the Finnish Institute at Athens on the Church Fathers, held in Athens on 17 May 1995 in the lecture room of the Italian Archaeological School at Athens. I have published a short version of this paper: «Ideas of ancient Greek Art in Christian Thought from Marcus Aurelius until Theodosius», *Rivista di Archeologia* (20, 1996) 54–8.

⁵⁰ On this important moment in Greek culture, see S. Walker and A. Cameron (eds), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (London 1989).

⁵¹ Middle-imperial *testimonia* on the Cnidian Aphrodite: Lucian, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.163–4; *Amores* 11–7 and 54; *Imagines* 4 and 6; *Pro imaginibus* 8.18 and 22–3; *Iuppiter Tragoedus* 10; Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* 17.4; Clement, *Protrepticus ad Graecos* 4.47–51; Philostratus, *Apollonius Tyanensis* 6.19 and 40; Athenaeus 13.591a–b; Aphrodite/Phryne at Delphi: Pseudo Dio Chrysostomus 37.28; Plutarch, *De Pythiae oraculis* 14–5; *De Alexandri fortuna aut virtute* 2.3; Amatorius 9; Pausanias 10.15.1; Aelian, *Varia historia* 9.32; Diogenes Laertius 6.2.60; Athenaeus 13.591b–c; Eros from Thespieae: Lucian, *Amores* 11 and 17; Pausanias 1.20.2 and 9.27.3–5; Athenaeus 13.591a–b; Alciphron 4.1, frg. 3; Aphrodite Anadiomene: Lucian, *Imagines* 7; Aelian, *Varia historia* 12.34 and Athenaeus 13.588c–590f.

⁵² On the Church Fathers' view of ancient works of art, see A. Prandi, «L'arte nel pensiero dei primi scrittori cristiani», *Tardo antico e alto medioevo* (Rome 1967) 105–20.

a. The criticism of Tatian.

Tatian, a heretical Christian writer, member of an extremist sect which condemned any sexual act and marriage, wrote the *Oratio ad Graecos* probably around 170 AD. This book contains the first outspoken condemnation by a Christian writer of Greek works of art as immoral. Tatian contrasts the Christians' respect for women with the pagan habit of representing subjects responsible for immoral behaviour and acts in bronze statues. He had seen these figures in Rome, where they had been taken from Greece, and supplies a list of them.⁵³

In this list he includes statues of poetesses, female musicians, women with strange pregnancies, courtesans and other beings regarded as morally disgusting.

The condemnation of images supposed to encourage licentious behaviour had antecedents in ancient Pagan opinion of works of art. The gilded bronze statue of Aphrodite/Phryne at Delphi—an image in precious materials of a famous courtesan, set upon a high column near the main altar of an important sanctuary—had already been criticised on the grounds it symbolised the licentiousness of the Greeks by the Cynics, firstly by Diogenes shortly after the dedication of this votive offering, and then by Cratetes and by others down to Aelian.⁵⁴ However, the Cynics criticised only a few particularly lascivious works. Now, with Tatian, the condemnation included all the ancient pagan images expressive of worldly culture. The Greeks seem to Tatian to have interpreted the art of making statues in a hedonistic way. As I have stressed, this idea is taken from the Second Sophistic culture of his age, but it is now emphasised and becomes a totally negative judgement on the pagan visual arts through the claim that they are immoral. In this context, there is no room for the consideration of ancient masterpieces as works of art, regardless of their subjects.

b. The opinion of Athenagoras.

However, at the same time in the Christian world there existed a very different view of the ancient pagan Greek arts, that of Athenagoras, as expressed in his *Legatio pro Christianis*. This writer was not a heretical Christian, but a follower of the Orthodox belief. A citizen of Athens, he clearly feels the heritage of Attic art criticism. Moreover, his *Legatio* was addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus and was an attempt to promote an image of the Christian religion in keeping with the Roman Empire, its institutions and culture.

In his pamphlet, Athenagoras gives much space to the criticism of the images of the pagan gods, claiming that they are false and only conventional representations of the

⁵³ See Tatian 33.35–35.37. On Tatian, see S. Di Cristina, *Taziano il Siro, Discorso ai Greci: apologetica cristiana e dogmi della cultura pagana* (Rome 1991) and M. Marcovich, *Tatiani oratio ad Graecos I* (Berlin 1995). The basis of the negative opinion towards idols of the Christians is, of course, biblical (see especially Isaiah 49.9–20, on the golden thread). The Christian dislike of pagan symbols is well expressed also by Tertullian, *Ad uxorem* 2.5. On the problem of locating these statues in Rome, see P. Gros, «Porticus Pompei», E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (4, 1999) 148–9, with earlier bibliography.

⁵⁴ See the *testimonia* on this statue cited in n. 51 and my article «The Monument of Phryne at Delphi», *NumAntCl* (26, 1997) 123–50.

gods and are therefore meaningless from a religious perspective.⁵⁵ At this point, he writes an excursus about the origins of the figurative arts, in order to show that the idols are merely results of craftsmanship.⁵⁶ In this excursus, Athenagoras indicates an interest toward the archaic phases of Greek art which is typical of an important sector of Antonine culture.⁵⁷

In contrast with Tatian, Athenagoras' criticism of pagan imagery is based not so much on moral grounds, but on gnoseological ones, based on the assertion that these idols are not faithful representations of the gods and that they are therefore meaningless from a religious perspective. Furthermore, they are representations of their subjects in completely human terms.

The idea that images of the gods are arbitrary and not credible representations was not new either. In particular, the important neo-sophist Lucian had stressed repeatedly, about 10–15 years before the publication of Athenagoras' *Legatio*, that the most famous representations of the gods were not reliable in terms of providing knowledge of the deities.⁵⁸

However, Athenagoras' criticism of pagan images is significant as he presents a systematic consideration of the issue, and expounds at length. Furthermore, his argumentation in favour of the Christian religion is of importance. The fact that this oration was given in an important cultural centre such as Athens and most probably on the occasion of a high level imperial visit to this city⁵⁹ suggest that this pamphlet did not pass unnoticed.

⁵⁵ See *Legatio* 15.1–27.2. On Athenagoras, see B. Pouderon, *Athenagore, Supplique au sujet des Chrétiens; et sur la résurrection des morts* (Paris 1992) and *D'Athènes à Alexandrie: études sur Athenagore et les origines de la philosophie chrétienne* (Leuven 1997).

⁵⁶ See 17.3–4. On the antiquarian sources used by Athenagoras for chapter 17 of his *Legatio*, see L.A. Rupprecht, «Athenagoras the Christian, Pausanias the Travel Guide, and a mysterious Corinthian Girl», *Harvard Theological Review* (85, 1992) 35–49. The theory expounded by this scholar, that Athenagoras lived between Corinth and Sicyon because he re-used Corinthian and, less probably, Sicyonian traditions seems unnecessary: Athenagoras could also have known these traditions from the important Athenian libraries of the time, among which the Library of Hadrian may have been the best (see n. 36).

⁵⁷ On the archaising culture of the Antonine period, with particular reference to Pausanias, see D. Musti *et alii* (eds), *Pausanias historien* (Geneve 1994) 79–116 and 207–76; C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1998); W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes I* (Amsterdam 1998) 61–363; 2 (Amsterdam 1999) 168–82 and 195–222 and R. Splitter, *Die «Kypseloslade» in Olympia* (Mainz 2000) 18–22 and 50.

⁵⁸ See especially Lucian, *De sacrificiis* 11; *Pro imaginibus* 8 and *Gallus* 24: the Second Sophistic writer from Samosata wrote these works around the years 160–5 (on the chronology of Lucian, see J.-J. Flinterman, «The Date of Lucian's Visit to Abonuteichos», *ZPE* (119, 1997) 280–2, with earlier bibliography), while Athenagoras wrote his pamphlet in 176 or a little after (see n. 59). In fact, the *topos* that images of gods are arbitrary and conventional goes back very early, as far as archaic philosophy: see in *primis Xenophanes*, *frgg.* 11–6 Edmonds.

⁵⁹ The oration was given by Athenagoras probably in front of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus when they visited Athens in September, 176: see T.D. Barnes, «The Embassy of Athenagoras», *Journal of Theological Studies* (26, 1975) 111–4; B.F. Harris, «The Defense of Christianity in Athenagoras' Embassy», *Journal of Religious History* (15, 1988–9) 413–24 and W.R. Schoedel, «Apologetic Literature and ambassadorial Activities», *Harvard Theological Review* (82, 1989) 55–78; hypercritical: P.L. Buck, «Athenagoras' Embassy: a literary Fiction», *Harvard Theological Review* (89, 1996) 209–26, who suggests that Athenagoras' *Embassy* is just a literary *topos*. However, a reference in *Legatio* 17.4 indicates that the passage is from a real oration of the written pamphlet: the writer mentions «the remaining idols by Phidias, the other Aphrodite at Cnidus art of

c. Callistratus' Response

I have already noted above that Callistratus wrote his *De statuis* most likely before 205 and have considered his assertions that he was divinely inspired in his descriptions of the statues. Moreover, he believed that these creations are sacred and that divine laws oblige us to consider them as such, because, after the wise creation of a statue of a deity, if the work of art is in keeping with its power and personality, the deity may dwell in the statue entering it by magic.⁶⁰ As suggested above, it is possible that Callistratus is here indirectly responding to Christian objections to statues of deities. This was also the case with several other pagan writers, who did not speak about Christianity openly so as not to admit the existence of this religion.⁶¹

If this hypothesis is accepted, then Callistratus may have been responding to the objections of Athenagoras, as both writers lived in Athens. Athenagoras had asserted that images of the gods are inconsistent from a theological perspective, objections to which Callistratus' comments seem appropriate responses. The chronological gap between the two works is less than 30 years (Athenagoras composed his oration probably in 176, Callistratus wrote before 205).

d. The criticism of Clement.

Tatian and Athenagoras' haphazard criticism of the Greek images of the gods was systematically and comprehensively elaborated upon by Clement in his *Protrepticus ad Graecos*, written at the beginning of the third century.⁶² Clement, in the fourth chapter of this book, criticised the production of statues of gods in the Greek world, giving the following reasons:

1. The statues are not gods, but works of men, resulting from a long historical process, in the beginning of which idols without human features were worshipped. Only in a later period, the development of the arts caused the worshipping of the gods to take the form of statues. This argument was not new and had previously been asserted by Athenagoras, with some variations. Clement gives a detailed illustration of the most

Praxiteles», with the implicit inclusion of a first Aphrodite among the idols made by Phidias: he refers clearly to the Ourania Aphrodite by Phidias set up on the north-western edge of the Agora of Athens. This reference is plausible only in the context of a real talk, in front of an audience of Athenians standing in or near the Agora who can immediately identify the reference to Phidias' idols with the one that is the closest to them, i.e. Aphrodite, aided by a gesture from the orator. This passage cannot have been conceived for an oration intended just to be read.

⁶⁰ See especially the passages collected at n. 34.

⁶¹ The habit to refer to Christians in an allusive way was already typical before Callistratus and Philostratus, as a habit of Apuleius as well as of Aelius Aristides: see S. Benko, «Pagan Criticism of Christianity during the first two Centuries A.D.», *ANRW* (2.23.2, 1980) 1055–118. Similar oblique references to Christianity seem to characterize Plotinus: see A. Meredith, «Porphyry and Julian against the Christians», *ibid.* 1119–49.

⁶² On the *Protrepticus*, see M. Galloni, *Clemente Alessandrino, Il Protreptico* (Rome 1991) and M. Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* (Leiden 1995). On the Platonism of Clement as it appears in the *Protrepticus*, see M.C. Isart Hernandez, «Citas Platónicas en el Protreptico de Clemente de Alejandria», *Cuadernos de filología clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* (3, 1993) 273–99 and L. Rizzerio, «L'accès à la transcendance divine selon Clement d'Alexandrie: dialectique platonicienne ou expérience de l'union Chrétienne?», *Revue des études augustiniennes* (44.2, 1998) 159–79.

ancient production of divine statues, especially in the Greek world, up until the time of Phidias, in keeping with the focus on archaic sculpture typical of the Second Sophistic world of Pausanias and Athenagoras.

2. The sacred images do not show the true forms of the gods as they were made in imitation of real people living in the time of their creators. Moreover, these creations are immoral, because these artists had transferred into their works subjective contents, such as their own loves, and ignoble ones at that, as the apparent subjects were lovers and courtesans. This argument was already present in Tatian.

3. The conventional character of the images of gods is strengthened by the observation that they can be recognised through attributes, which characterises these figures in a materialistic way.

4. The immoral character of the statues of gods results from both the way in which they were made (point 2) and their appearance (points 2 and 3). Thus they excite the lowest and most bestial instincts of human beings.

The supposedly corruptive character of the pagan images, said to promote sinful acts, had already been argued by Tatian, clearly one of the main antecedents of Clement's criticism against the figurative arts of the Greeks. Clement gives as evidence to support his thesis the well-known phenomenon of men making love to statues.⁶³

5. The images of gods are the result of human working of materials taken from the earth and therefore they are not living beings. It is thus irrational to consider them deities and to worship them. This thesis, enunciated in chapter four, is further developed in chapter ten.

Clement's is the most systematic and complete refutation of the divine character of the pagan idols to be written by a Christian. Clement combats the idea that some statues are echoes of the true forms of the gods and reveal their true presence. Such a criticism, occupying a large section of the *Protrepticus* and argued with much enthusiasm, indicates that these beliefs were still common in the pagan societies of the provinces of the empire with a strong Greek culture, a little after the year 200.

Clement, expressing a Christian Platonism,⁶⁴ begins his argument with the requirement, of remote Platonic origin, that images no longer be made in imitation of external forms and that they communicate, as far as it is possible, the transcendent truth. This point of departure is close to that already mentioned for the Philostratan Apollonius, except that Clement, who does not believe in the divine subjects of the Greek *agalmatopoiia*, reaches conclusions which are quite far from those asserted in the *Life of Apollonius*, denying any possible value for the statues. Rather, he considers them to be false as they represent something that does not exist, and they are thus misleading.

⁶³ On *agalmatophilia*, see R. Robert, «Ars regenda amore. Seduction érotique et plaisir esthétique de Praxitele a Ovide», *MEFR* (104, 1992) 373–438, and my article cited at n. 37.

⁶⁴ See n. 62. On the vitality of pagan religion under the Severans, see R.M. Krill, «Roman Paganism under the Antonines and Severans», *ANRW* (2.16.1, 1978) 27–44; moreover K. Clinton, «The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors», *ibidem* (2.18.2, 1989) 1499–539; R.E. Oster, «Ephesus as a Religious Center under the Principate, I. Paganism before Constantine», *ibidem* (2.18.3, 1990) 1661–728; and F.W. Norris, «Antioch on-the-Orontes as a Religious Center, I. Paganism before Constantine», *ibidem* (2.18.4, 1990) 2322–79.

e. Philostratus' Response.

It was mentioned above that Philostratus attributes to Apollonius the claim that the wise artist, through his imagination, is able to translate the true being of the gods into human terms. This defence of the reliability of these works of art in showing wise insights into the nature of the deities, was made in a literary work completed after 217. It may therefore have been made as a defence of the faithfulness of the Greek statues of the gods and thus intended as an implicit answer to the objections raised by Tatian, Athenagoras and especially, more recently and systematically, by Clement.

f. The continuation of early Christian criticism against pagan *agalmata* in later periods and subsequent attitudes.

In the Christian world after Clement, the arguments of this great thinker were repeated with a few original additions. The important episode of the entry of these arguments into Latin culture is marked especially by the related section of the *Adversus gentes* of Arnobius, written *ca.* 300 in Sicca Veneria in Africa Proconsularis.⁶⁵

The triumph of Christianity meant that the objections of the Apologists to pagan idols could be translated into an operative programme. Beginning in the last years of Constantine's reign, and especially during the reign of Constantius II, the idea of banning pagan idols and persecuting their worshippers was clearly enunciated in imperial laws. A law of Constantine had already limited the freedom of making pagan sacrifices and was reinforced by Constantius II in 341.⁶⁶

Firmicus Maternus was the first Christian writer to argue, in his *De errore profanarum religionum*, written probably before 346, that pagan cults no longer be tolerated.⁶⁷ He is likely to have inspired the anti-pagan legislation of Constantius II. This emperor prescribed the closure of pagan temples in 346,⁶⁸ banned nocturnal sacrifices in 353⁶⁹ and also the worshipping of images in 356.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ Arnobius 6.12–27. On Arnobius, see M.B. Simmons, *Arnobius of Sicca: religious Conflict and Competition in the Age of Diocletian* (Oxford 1995). On the pagan belief that statues were endowed with life in Arnobius, see F. Heim, «L'animation des statues d'après les apologistes du III^e siècle (Tertullien, Minucius Felix, Arnobe)», *Revue des Études Latines* (70, 1992) 22–3.

⁶⁶ *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.1 and 2. See M. Perez Medina, «Sobre la prohibición de sacrificios por Constantino», *Florentia Iliberritana* (7, 1996) 229–39. On the religious policy of Constantine, H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: the Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore 2000) and A. Marcone, *Costantino il Grande* (Rome 2000). On the Theodosian Code, J.F. Matthews, *Laying down the Law: a Study of the Theodosian Code* (New Haven 2000).

⁶⁷ Firmicus Maternus, *De errore profanarum religionum* 29.1–4. On the *De errore* as a source for the pagan belief that statues were endowed with the soul and personality of the deity they represented, see M. Bettini, «Un Dioniso di gesso: Firm. Mat. De err. prof. rel. 6, 1 sgg. (Orph. fr. 214 Kern)», *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* (43, 1993) 103–8. On the influence of Firmicus Maternus on the following legislation which progressively restricted and finally banned pagan worship, see A. Wlosok, «Zur Lateinischen Apologetik der Constantinischen Zeit (Arnobius, Lactantius, Firmicus Maternus)», *Gymnasium* (96, 1989) 133–48 and M.L. Barnard, «L'intolleranza negli apologisti cristiani con speciale riguardo a Firmico Materno», *Cristianesimo nella Storia* (11, 1990) 505–21.

⁶⁸ *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.4. On the religious policy of this emperor, see G. Marasco, «L' 'Expositio totius mundi et gentium' e la politica religiosa di Costanzo II», *Ancient Society* (27, 1996) 183–203.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem* 16.10.5.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem* 16.10.6.

Firmicus' influence declined, of course, with the end of Constantius II's reign. In fact, after the restitution of the freedom to practice pagan cults and the consequent re-opening of Pagan temples by the emperor Julian in the early 360s, both pagan and Christian cults enjoyed freedom of worship for a couple of decades (the 360s and the 370s).

However, with the ascent of Theodosius to the throne, a new flow of anti-pagan laws was decreed: sacrifices were banned in 381;⁷¹ the prohibition of sacrifices was repeated, and fortune-telling was forbidden as well, in 385;⁷² worshipping gods was banned in 391⁷³ and finally the prohibition of any aspect of pagan cults and the closure of the temples was decreed in 391,⁷⁴ reinforced in 392⁷⁵ and repeated in 395,⁷⁶ in 396,⁷⁷ in 399,⁷⁸ in 407,⁷⁹ in 415,⁸⁰ in 423⁸¹ and in 435.⁸² As is widely known, with these changed conditions the fervour for the destruction of pagan statues reached its peak during the last two decades of the fourth century.

Libanius in particular, in his oration *Pro templis*, written probably in 386 and concerning the destruction of Pagan temples and statues in Syria,⁸³ and Palladas, focused in his epigrams on the destruction of the pagan statues of Alexandria, especially ferocious during the Christian sack of the city in 391,⁸⁴ show indeed two salient moments of this phenomenon.

Finally, the repeated reinforcement of anti-pagan legislation during the first decades of the fifth century was accompanied in the most radical areas of Christian culture, such as Syria by a contempt toward classical Greek statues, even those made by the most renowned masters of their time. Allegations propounded already by Tatian and Clement against the idols (that they are material works of sculptors and not gods and

⁷¹ *Ibidem* 16.10.7. On the religious policy of Julian, see B. Cabouret, «Julien et Delphes: la politique religieuse de l'empereur Julien et le 'dernier' oracle», *Revue des Études Anciennes* (99.1–2, 1997) 141–58. On the religious policy of Theodosius, see R.M. Errington, «Christian Accounts of the religious Legislation of Theodosius I», *Klio* (79.2, 1997) 398–443.

⁷² *Ibid.* 16.10.9.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 16.10.10.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 16.10.11.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 16.10.12.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 16.10.13.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 16.10.14.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 16.10.16.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 16.10.19.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 16.10.20 and 21. On the religious policy of Theodosius II, see K. Ilski, *Sobory w polityce religijnej Teodozjusze II* (Poznan 1992).

⁸¹ *Ibid.* 16.10.22 and 23.

⁸² *Ibid.* 16.10.25.

⁸³ See Libanius, *Pro templis*, especially 8; 22 and 45. On Libanius' *Pro templis* and its historical/religious background, see H.–U. Wiemer, «Die Rangstellung des Sophisten Libanios unter den Kaisern Julian, Valens und Theodosius: mit einem Anhang ueber Abfassung und Verbreitung von Libanios' *Rede Fuer die Tempel* (Or. 30)», *Chiron* (25, 1995) 89–130.

⁸⁴ See Palladas, *Anthologia Graeca* 9.180–3; 378; 441; 501; 528; 773; 10.53; and 16.282. On Palladas as a source for the destruction of pagan symbols, see A. Schroeder, «Palladas», *Lampas* (29.4, 1996) 380–90.

that their images are immoral and sexual) were stressed again, but with original examples, by Theodoret of Antiochia, in *ca.* 420.⁸⁵ As this monk was soon to become, after 423, very well-established and influential in his capacity as the bishop of Cyrrha, it is possible that his hard-line stance influenced the last anti-pagan law of Theodosius II, in 435.

g. The Church Fathers as a medium between Second Sophistic culture and later idealisations of ancient art.

From this review of some of the most creative and influential opinions on classical Greek works of art stated by the Church Fathers, it is possible to argue that it was they who transmitted to posterity the hedonistic conception of the Greek classical visual arts, which had been previously developed within the culture of the Second Sophistic.

This hedonistic interpretation was one of the main reasons for the early Church Fathers' negative opinion of such works.

However, when this negative judgement receded, or was at least limited just to the religious field (for this trend, see section five of this article), the persistence of the idea of ancient art as an art of pleasure paved the way for the appreciation of ancient works of art as a sort of paradisiacal and mythical lost beauty, which we can follow in its development from mid-Byzantine culture through to the western Renaissance.⁸⁶

4. The opinion that contemporary monuments are more beautiful than ancient Greek ones, from the Mosella of Ausonius to Apollinaris Sidonius and after.

It was stressed above that Philostratus had proposed the substitution of the concept of *mimesis* with the concept of *phantasia* as the intellectual activity that should preside during the creation of the best statues of deities. This conclusion brings to a head a trend that had been developing probably from the first century BC until the second century AD. However, Philostratus' argumentation did not involve a negative opinion of the statues of deities by the greatest Greek classical masters. On the contrary, the works of these masters are rather updated and seen with fresh eyes and considered more in keeping with this theoretical *desideratum* than works made in other cultural contexts.

A similar consideration could also be made in regard to Callistratus: he does not pay much attention to the rhythmic values that had been regarded by Hellenistic art critics as typical of Greek classical masters, such as the specific *symmetriae*, the proportions and the general construction of the figures. Instead, he focused on the main standards by which works of art were praised in the ripe and late Imperial times: the sense of life, the changes of the colours through their surfaces, their allegorical meanings and finally, the notion that these acclaimed works were made through magic, may thus be endowed with the personalities of the represented subjects and may therefore be regarded as miracles.

⁸⁵ See Theodoret, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, 371–85. On the relation between Theodoret and the imperial power, see H. Leppin, *Von Konstantin dem Grossen zu Theodosius II. das Christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret* (Goettingen 1996). On Theodoret as source on the destruction of pagan sanctuaries in Syria, see J. Balty, «Le sanctuaire oraculaire de Zeus Belas à Apamée», *Topoi* (7.2, 1997) 791–9.

⁸⁶ I have tried to outline this process in my article «Le descrizioni dei capolavori antichi dell'Antologia Planudea», *Rivista di Archeologia* (Suppl. 17, 1996) 81–5.

Again, he does not perceive any distance between his own concept of visual beauty and the one suggested by the masterpieces of Scopas, Praxiteles and Lysippus which he describes. On the contrary, he regards these statues as absolutely in keeping with his own taste.

However, exponents of Christian culture from the fourth century onwards were going to change this critical position and to acknowledge that the ancient Greek works of art were not only completely out of line with their own religion, but also not to their taste. The most successful contemporary buildings, with their stage-like appearances, their integration into the natural landscape, the emphasis given to their internal spaces, and the most admired works of visual arts of the time, usually mosaics and wall paintings, so bright and full of colour, were considered much more beautiful than ancient works of art, regarded now as cold, life-less and colourless.

The first statement clearly in this direction can be found in a poem of Ausonius. A Christian, he was nevertheless very learned in classical culture as well as an admirer of ancient works of art, which he described especially in his epigrams (see below, section five). However, in his poem *Mosella*, written probably after July 371, when he was living at *Augusta Trevirorum*, in the Imperial court, he shows that his own tastes were not particularly classical.⁸⁷

In this poem, the late-Roman villas dotted along the Moselle river are praised for their scenic impact and their integration with the natural landscape. These creations are thought by the poet to have nothing to envy the renowned monuments of classical Greek architects and artists, including the *Artemisium* of Ephesus, the Parthenon, the monuments made by Philon of Eleusis and Dinochares, etc.⁸⁸ His expression (287–8) «Quis (...)/(...) miretur (...)?» «Who can marvel at, etc.?», followed by a list of renowned Greek landscapes and monuments, indicates that, for him, the ancient Greek beauties are second-rate.

An indifference towards classical Greek works of art must have become quite fashionable from the late fourth century. The late fifth-century pagan historian Zosimus complains that the destruction by fire at Constantinople in 404 of statues of the Muses which had been previously removed from the sanctuary of these goddesses on Mount Helicon by Constantine reveals «very clearly that the patent indifference to the Muses was about to spread over everything».⁸⁹

⁸⁷ On Ausonius, see R.P.H. Green, *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford 1991) xxiv–xxxii; on the *Mosella*, 456–514; see also the critical edition of this poet by R.P.H. Green, *Decimi Magni Ausonii Opera* (Oxford 1999), the *Mosella* is at 126–43. Moreover, specifically on the *Mosella*, M.E. Consoli, *Mosella/ Ausonio* (Galatina 1998) and D. Shanzer, «The Date and literary Context of Ausonius» *Mosella*, P.E. Knox and C. Foss (eds), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendel Clausen* (Stuttgart 1998) 284–305 and *Historia* (47.2, 1998) 204–33.

⁸⁸ See especially *Mosella* 20–2 and 283–348, in particular 298–317. On the concept of beauty revealed by Ausonius in his *Mosella*, see R.P.H. Green, «Man and Nature in Ausonius' Moselle», *Illinois Classical Studies* (14, 1989) 303–15 and S. Schroeder, «Das Lob des Flusses als strukturierendes Moment im Moselgedicht des Ausonius», *Rheinisches Museum* (141, 1998) 45–91.

⁸⁹ Zosimus, *Historia nova* 5.24.6. On Zosimus, see F. Paschoud, «L'impero romano cristiano visto da un Pagano: la storia nuova di Zosimo», G. Reggi (ed.), *Storici latini e storici greci di età imperiale* (Lugano 1990) 189–204. On the topographical setting of this episode, see A. Berger, «Die Senate von Konstantinopel», *Boreas* (18, 1995) 131–42.

A confirmation that contemporary works of art, especially architecture, were regarded as more exciting than those of the Greek classical era, is given by Sidonius Apollinaris, in a poem written at *Avitacum* in Alvernia, probably in 463: the lavish house of Consentius, a friend of the poet, at *Narbo Majus*, in southern France, is eulogised. The poet had been a guest of Consentius there a little earlier. Sidonius praises the private baths and the dining room of Consentius' palace:⁹⁰ these residential quarters and the sculptures set up there are explicitly considered better than the creations of the most famous masters of classical Greece.⁹¹ It should be noted that the visual arts of classical Greece were represented only by sculpture: in fact, no painters are mentioned, but the sculptors Praxiteles, Scopas, Polyclitus and Phidias are evoked. Ancient Greek visual arts were thus considered synonymous with sculpture. On the contrary, the most acclaimed «modern» achievements were internal spaces, such as baths and dining rooms. So, the definition of internal spaces of the late Roman residential architecture with mosaics and paintings was considered more exciting than statues from the classical Greek past.

This taste will become firmly rooted in the Constantinopolitan culture of the sixth century. Churches and other architectural and artistic achievements of this world are praised in ecphrastic writings. Stage-like facades, internal spaces, «shining» appearances, a sense of life and a polychromy in mosaics and paintings and allegorical representations were considered particularly exciting.

It is clear that the writers of ecphrastic works of this age, such as those from Gaza (Johannes, Procopius and Choricus),⁹² Paulus Silentarius, who had described the Church of St Sophia at Constantinople,⁹³ and also Procopius from Caesarea, in his work *De aedificiis*, on the buildings set up or restored by Justinian,⁹⁴ and indeed their public

⁹⁰ Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina* 23.495–506. On Sidonius Apollinaris, see J. Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome, AD 407–485* (Oxford 1994) and F.M. Kaufmann, *Studien zu Sidonius Apollinaris* (Frankfurt 1995).

⁹¹ See especially 502–6: «no statues or likenesses to compare with these/ were ever fashioned in bronze or marble or colors/ by Mentor Praxiteles or Scopas:/ Polycleetus himself did not mould any so great,/ nor did Phidias with his chisel» (transl. Loeb). See the pertinent comment by G. Calcani, *L'antichità marginale* (Rome 1993) 49–56.

⁹² On the ecphrastic literary production of the age of Justinian, see P. Friedlaender, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius. Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit* (Berlin 1912) and Idem, *Spaetantiker Gemaeldezyklus in Gaza: des Prokopios von Gaza Ekphrasis eikonos* (Vatican City 1939). On the Byzantine ekphrasis of Christian architecture, see R. Webb, «The Aesthetics of sacred Space», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (53, 1999) 59–74. On Johannes of Gaza as an ecphrastic poet, see C. Cupane, «Il kosmos pinax di Giovanni di Gaza. Una proposta di ricostruzione», *Jahrbuch der Oesterreichischen Byzantinistik* (28, 1979) 195–207. On Procopius of Gaza as evidence for architecture and painting, see M. Falla Castelfranchi, «Alcuni problemi dell'architettura e della scultura paleocristiana della Siria settentrionale», *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Archeologia e Storia Antica dell'Università G. d'Annunzio* (1, 1980) 69–84. On Choricus, see P.K. Litsas, *Choricus of Gaza: an Approach to his Work* (Ann Arbor 1999). On Choricus as an ecphrastic writer, see H. Maguire, «The half-cone Vault of St. Stephen at Gaza», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (32, 1978) 319–25 and H.G. Thuemmel, «Die Schilderung der Sergioskirche in Gaza und ihre Dekoration bei Chorikios von Gaza», U. Lange and R. Soerries (eds), *Vom Orient bis an den Rhein* (Dettelbach 1997) 49–64.

⁹³ See M.–Ch. Fayan and P. Chuvin, *Paule le Silentiaire, Description de Sainte-Sophie de Constantinople* (Die 1997).

⁹⁴ On Procopius from Caesarea, see A. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century* (London 1985). On the *De aedificiis*, see D. Roques, «Les 'Constructions de Justinien' de Procope de Césarée: document ou monument?», *CRAI* (1998) 989–1001.

believe that certain buildings, and especially some exceptional churches, are the most beautiful creations ever made by humans. The Church of St Sophia in Constantinople is thought in particular by Paulus Silentiarius to represent the highest achievement of the art of architecture. Comparisons with ancient buildings and works of art are not frequent, but there is little doubt that most people in the Constantinopolitan society of that age believed that the Church of St Sophia was far more beautiful than any ancient temple and that the most beautiful mosaics and reliefs that decorated their most noteworthy buildings were much better than any surviving ancient statues.

Not only had religion changed, but also artistic taste. The comparison of contemporary artistic creations and works by the most famous masters of classical Greece in Procopius from Caesarea, *De aedificiis* 1.11.3–9 is enlightening as it is explicit. Procopius wrote this work probably in the early 560s, having perhaps been commissioned to write it by the emperor Justinian, as a panegyric to the emperor and of his building policy. It was probably recited during an official ceremony in one of the last years of Justinian's reign. The opinions expressed in this work are therefore likely to reflect those of the imperial court. Procopius thus mainly discusses monuments set up or restored by Justinian during his own time, at Constantinople as well as in other parts of the empire. He prizes particularly the preciousness, the richness of colours, the «shining» appearance of the buildings and of their painted and carved decorations. Even of statues he praises especially the colours, i.e. the brightness of the white marbles and the shining surfaces of the bronzes. He clearly believes that his own age is a very happy period for the flourishing of the visual arts. In the passage considered here, he describes the Arcadian public baths by the sea outside Constantinople. The main value of this building noted by Procopius is the brightness of the light as well as the relationship of the buildings he describes with their land- and sea-scapes. In other words, it is the scenic impact of the building complex that matters.⁹⁵ Procopius asserts that both the bronze and the marble statues of these baths have nothing to be ashamed of compared with those made by Phidias, Lysippus and Praxiteles.⁹⁶

Finally, the belief of the superiority of the best contemporary artists over the most renowned artists of classical Greece will be endorsed, with an extremist assertion, after the Byzantine «dark age» within the optimistic atmosphere of the late ninth-century «renaissance», by the Patriarch Photius in his *Homelias* 10.5. Ar ii.433.⁹⁷ In this passage, Photius is speaking on the occasion of the inauguration of the newly rebuilt Church of Our Lady of the Pharos, inside the imperial palace of Constantinople, probably in April 864, and in the presence of the emperor Michael III. He says that «the appearance of the

⁹⁵ On these baths, see A. Berger, *Das Bad in der Byzantinischen Zeit* (Muenchen 1982) 109; 112 and especially 145.

⁹⁶ Procopius, *De aedificiis* 1.11.7.

⁹⁷ On Photius and his outstanding classical learning, see J. Schamp, *Photios historien des lettres* (Paris 1987). On his Aristotelian education, see J. Schamp, «Photios Aristotelisant? Remarques critiques», in M. Billerbeck and J. Schamp (eds), *Kainotomia: die Erneuerung der Griechischen Tradition: Colloquium Pavlos Tzermias* (4. November 1995) (Freiburg 1996) 1–17. The most important body of evidence on the consideration of ancient visual arts in Constantinople during the so-called Byzantine «dark age» is that of the record of ancient statues standing at Constantinople at the time given in the early eighth-century *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*: see Cameron and Herrin (n. 48). However, a comparison of these ancient works of art with modern achievements is not suggested here.

pavement which has been fashioned into the forms of living beings and other shapes of figures by means of variegated tesserae, exhibits the marvellous wisdom of the artist, so that even creators of moulded images (*plasmaton plastai*) as the famous Phidias and Parrhasius and Praxiteles and Zeuxis are proved in truth to have been mere children in their art». ⁹⁸

Thus, the mosaicist of this floor is a wise artist, because of the sense of life as well as of the different colours and shapes of tesserae used. The most famous artists of classical Greece are though to be mere children and are contemptuously dismissed. Even though Photius refers to two sculptors and two painters, his association of these four artists with *plasmaton plastai* indicates that he conceives of the classical Greek visual arts almost exclusively in terms of sculpture. ⁹⁹ Contemporary mosaics full of colour are better than ancient statues. Photius is the last writer to suggest the concept of superiority of the present toward the past in the field of the visual arts.

In the western world, an enthusiasm towards works and styles of ancient art can be traced already from the classicist trend which is typical of the Carolingian culture of the early ninth century. ¹⁰⁰

A similar high regard for ancient masterpieces brought to Constantinople is known in the Byzantine environment from the early tenth century, i.e. from the first generation after Photius: Arethas of Caesarea is, as far as I know, the first writer after the Byzantine «dark age» to consider a famous ancient statue made by a renowned classical master as a precious object, which excites his interest, while the late-antique architectural context of this statue is considered as its mere back-cloth. ¹⁰¹ This new trend was soon to become stronger, leading to a sense of inferiority of the present towards the past as well as to the consideration of ancient art as a sort of lost paradise in the Constantinopolitan culture of the generation after Arethas. ¹⁰² This change of judgement and taste evidenced at Constantinople from the tenth century coincides probably not by chance with the

⁹⁸ See, on this homely, C. Mango, *The homilies of Photius patriarch of Constantinople* (Cambridge Mass. 1958) 177–90.

⁹⁹ This conclusion is also supported by the references to statues in the *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai* (n. 48).

¹⁰⁰ On Carolingian dependence on ancient models, see McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge 1994) and Ch. Stiegemann and M. Vemhoff (eds), 799, *Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit* (Mainz 1999). The appreciation of Vitruvius as paradigmatic for Carolingian culture is a very important symptom for the establishment of a classicist mentality: see S. Schuler, *Vitruv im Mittelalter* (Koeln 1999) 47–51; 135–42; 341 and 347–50. The re-use of the iconography of the equestrian gilded bronze statue of Marcus Aurelius at Rome in order to represent Charlemagne seems equally important: see L. de Lachenal, «Il monumento nel medioevo fino al suo trasferimento in Campidoglio», A. Melucco Vaccaro and A. Sommella Mura (eds), *Marco Aurelio* (Milan 1989) 129–55.

¹⁰¹ See especially Arethas, *scholium* to Aristides, *Orationes* 50.408.701.710 Dindorf, on the statue of Athena in the *Forum* of Constantine, in front of the *propylum* of the senate house, thought by him to be Phidias' Athena Promachus, as well as on the statue of a sea goddess standing nearby, thought by him to represent Thetis. Arethas' interest in ancient statues is shown also in *scholium* to Lucian, *Amores* 11–2, on Praxiteles' Cnidian Aphrodite; in *scholium* to Clement, *Protrepticus* 1.2, on the bronze statue of Eunomus at Delphi; 4.47, on Phidias' Zeus of Olympia, on his Athena Parthenos as well as on an Aphrodite by the same sculptor; and 4.51, on paintings and style of Apelles. See my comments in *Prassitele*. 3 (n. 2) 120–2; 193–4 and 196, n. 2535.

¹⁰² 102. I have followed this trend in my book *Prassitele*. 3 (n. 2) 122–67 and have given my conclusions in my article cited at n. 86.

beginning of an intense penetration by the western powers of the eastern Mediterranean world, and implies perhaps that a sense of decadence was increasingly felt within Byzantine society, which gradually came to include also the *via artis* of this civilisation, when compared to its ancient equivalent.¹⁰³

5. The distinction between ancient works of art, which can be admired, and their religious meanings and contexts, to be condemned and rejected, within Christian culture from the fourth century onwards.

In the ancient world, the notion of works of art entirely split from their message, and especially from their religious content is encountered only infrequently. The secularisation of museal institutions is the result of a long process.

At Pergamum, a collection of important statues made by renowned masters was kept in the sanctuary of Athena, and so the works of art exhibited there were sacred to this goddess, even if, as is likely, a consideration of these creations from an artistic point of view was already prevailing upon the approach to them as sacred works.¹⁰⁴

In Rome, the process of the secularisation of museal institutions seems to have been gradually strengthened. For example, the statues exhibited in the *porticus Octaviae* had been also set up in an area sacred to Jupiter Stator as well as to Juno Regina,¹⁰⁵ the statues kept in the *atrium Libertatis* were dedicated to the goddess Libertas¹⁰⁶ and those collected in the *templum Pacis* were under the protection of the goddess Pax.¹⁰⁷ However, it cannot be denied that the main interest of the Roman viewers of these works was probably an artistic one, as can be argued from the references made to these masterpieces by Pliny the Elder, who is our main source for their presence in Rome.¹⁰⁸ The religious meaning of these works was thus regarded probably as less important than the artistic.

This process of secularisation of the approach to ancient Greek statues comes to a head with fourth-century Christian culture, when at least one section of Christian society begins to approach these works of art pre-eminently from an artistic rather than a religious point of view. The idea of preserving some aspects of classical culture is the

¹⁰³ On the increasing western presence in the Byzantine empire from the tenth century, see K.N. Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople: the West and Byzantium* (Leiden 1996). On the dawn of the establishment of a «humanistic» mentality at Constantinople, see P. Lemerle, *Byzantine Humanism: the first Phase* (Camberra 1986) 121–346 and N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1996) 79–272.

¹⁰⁴ On the gradual secularization of museal institutions in the Greek world, see M.C. Ruggieri Tricoli and M.D. Vacireca, *L'idea di museo. Archetipi della comunicazione museale nel mondo antico* (Palermo 1998). On the sculptural collection of the sanctuary of Athena, see J.J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge 1986) 166–7; see also E. Polito, *I Galati vinti* (Milan 1999) 23–49; with earlier biography at 87–8.

¹⁰⁵ On the *porticus Octaviae* and its collection of masterpieces by Greek masters, see A. Viscogliosi, «Porticus Octaviae», E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (4, 1999) 141–5.

¹⁰⁶ On the *atrium Libertatis*, where the *monumenta Asini Pollionis* stood, see C.M. Amici, «Atrium Libertatis», *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* (68, 1995–6) 295–321 and *idem*, «Atrium Libertatis», E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (5, 1999) 229.

¹⁰⁷ On the *templum Pacis*, see R. Santangeli Valenzani, «Pax, templum», E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (5, 1999) 285–6.

¹⁰⁸ See Isager (n. 44) 157–68.

result of a long process. Already Athenagoras, at *Legatio pro Christianis* 18.2, in the 170s, had asserted that «certainly I do not consider it my task to condemn images.» So, while he was opposed to the religious meaning of these images, he did not deny their artistic value. Moreover, Tertullian (*De idolatria* 11), probably towards 211, had argued for the right of the children of Christians to learn about classical mythology.¹⁰⁹

However, a sincere and deep admiration towards ancient works of art can be found in Christian culture only from the fourth century onwards. In his *Mosella*, Ausonius demonstrates that he regards the villas of his own time along the Moselle river as not being inferior to the most renowned ancient Greek monuments. However, he demonstrates his admiration for ancient works of art as well, especially in his epigrams,¹¹⁰ where he appears to share the typically late-antique interpretation of classical Greek statues as being magically endowed with the life of their subjects.¹¹¹

Moreover, when Christianity prevailed in the Roman empire, laws were issued for the preservation of pagan monuments.

Already in 342, Constantius II prescribed that certain temples remain untouched and unharmed.¹¹²

In the year 382, Gratian, Valentinian II and Theodosius prescribed to the Duke of Osrhoene that «the temple shall be continually open (...) in which images are reported to have been placed which must be measured by the value of their art rather than by their divinity (*artis pretio quam divinitate*)».¹¹³

The temple mentioned in this decree was probably at Edessa. This decree shows that this temple could be regarded as a museum, where statues were collected and regarded more as works of art than as idols. The distinction in this decree between the *artis pretium*, which is regarded as a positive value, and *divinitas*, to be condemned, is particularly noteworthy, as it shows that a conscious approach to ancient statues as simply works of art had come to a head at that time.

Another decree of Arcadius and Honorius, dated to 399 and therefore following the closure of the pagan temples in 391–2, prescribes that the «ornaments» (*ornamenta*) of former pagan buildings should be preserved.¹¹⁴ Another decree, also of 399, allows the continuation of festal assemblies of citizens, which had pagan backgrounds.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁹ On Tertullian, see E. Osborn, *Tertullian: First Theologian of the West* (Cambridge 1997). On the *De idolatria*, see S. Buttarro, «Analisi della struttura compositiva del 'De idolatria' di Tertulliano», *Rudiae* (7, 1995) 81–102.

¹¹⁰ See Ausonius, *Epigrammata* 12; 18; 22; 57 and 62–71 Green.

¹¹¹ See O. Fua, «L'idea dell'opera d'arte 'vivente' e la bucula di Mirone nell'epigramma greco e latino», *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* (15, 1973) 49–55.

¹¹² *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.3.

¹¹³ *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.8 (transl. C. Pharr). On the institution between late fourth and early fifth centuries of secular museums in which to preserve statues that had previously been worshipped as pagan idols and were now admired simply as works of art, see C. Lepellet, «Le musée des statues divines. La volonté de sauvegarder le patrimoine artistique païen à l'époque theodosienne», *Cahiers archéologiques. Fin de l'antiquité et moyen âge* (42, 1994) 5–15.

¹¹⁴ *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.15. The word *ornamenta* refers probably to statues, paintings, and other works of art as well as to the entablatures of the temples: see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s.v. *ornamentum* i, A, 2, c and ii, B, 1, b.

¹¹⁵ *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.17.

The need to protect pagan monuments and to be able to admire them in secular museums is thus felt to be important exactly in the years when the religious worship of the pagans was finally prohibited.

The written evidence of these views hence becomes rather widespread for the first decades of the fifth century, probably because, with the definitive victory of Christianity, a positive evaluation of ancient works of art became normal, at least amongst a significant section of Christian culture.

The Provincial Council of *Africa Proconsularis*, on 16 June 401, limited the destruction of temples and idols to those placed in remote areas or on private properties, because «they give no embellishment» (*nullo ornamento sunt*).¹¹⁶

After 405, the opinion that marble and bronze sculptures should be preserved and admired only as works of art was stated very clearly by Prudentius.¹¹⁷

Again, Honorius in 407¹¹⁸ and Majorianus in 458¹¹⁹ prescribe that temples and statues which are *ornamenta* to their cities should be kept undamaged and eventually could be re-used.

Unsurprisingly, given the success of the consideration of these monuments just as works of art, secular museums become widespread, especially in Italy and in north/western Africa, at least from the last quarter of the fourth century.

At Rome, statues, including works of important ancient masters, were removed from their previous settings and collected in the north-western section of the Roman *Forum*, especially in front of the Basilica Julia, probably by the Praefectus Urbis of 416, Gabinius Vettius Probianus.¹²⁰

At Verona, the governor of *Venetia et Histria*, Valerius Palladius, had moved an unprotected statue from the *Capitolium* to the *forum*, which was thus seen as a sort of museum, already between 379 and 383.¹²¹

At Literna, the governor of Campania, Audentius Aemilianus, had moved pagan statues from their previous sacred settings, now deserted, to the *thermae Severianae* of this town, probably a little before 379.¹²²

At *Beneventum*, a pagan statue was also moved from its previous setting to the local baths, where it was then regarded as a shining ornament (*splendor*) of the building,

¹¹⁶ *Concilia Africae*, ed. Munier, C.C.L. 149, 205, Reg. Carth. 58.

¹¹⁷ See Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 2.481–4 and *Contra Symmachum* 1.501–5. On Prudentius and his *Contra Symmachum*, see G. Garuti, *Contra Symmachum/Prudentius* (L'Aquila 1996) and Gnilka (n. 2). On the *Peristephanon*, see L. Rivero Garcia, *Obras. 2/Prudencio* (Madrid 1997).

¹¹⁸ *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.19.

¹¹⁹ Majorianus, *Novellae* 4 (161 M.).

¹²⁰ *CIL* 6.1156; 1658; 3864; 31883–6 and 41337–8: see my book *Prassitele. Fonti epigrafiche e letterarie. Vita e opere. 1. Fonti epigrafiche; fonti letterarie dall'età dello scultore al medio impero* (Rome 1988) 30 and 39–40, ns. 124–32 (on the probability that this Gabinius Vettius Probianus is the Praefectus Urbis of 416 and not the name-sake of 377, see n. 127 of this book) and C.F. Giuliani and P. Verduchi, «Basilica Iulia», E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (1, 1993) 177–9; S. Panciera (ed.), *Iscrizioni Greche e Latine del Foro Romano del Palatino* (Rome 1996) 200–3, no. 59; and idem, *CIL* 6. 8. 3. (Berlin 2000) 4727; 4769; and 5067.

¹²¹ *CIL* 5. 3332: see Lepelley (n. 113) 12.

¹²² *CIL* 10. 3714: see Lepelley (n. 113) 11.

probably around the end of fourth century,¹²³ and another statue was brought from a deserted place to the *forum* between 425 and 450.¹²⁴

In Africa, at *Caesarea* (Cherchel), the capital of the Mauretania Caesariana, four statues of deities were brought from elsewhere to the Large Western Baths, perhaps during the reign of Theodosius.¹²⁵

Finally, a contemporary public collection of ancient statues of deities has been discovered at Bulla Regia, in *Numidia Proconsularis*, where an ancient sanctuary was transformed into a museum.¹²⁶

Consideration of this evidence leads to the conclusion that secular museums of pagan statues were being established, in Italy, in north-western Africa as well as in Osrhoene, during the period 375–450. In some cases, and still in the late fourth century, as at Bulla Regia and probably at Edessa, former temples were given this new function. In other cities, again still in the last decades of the fourth century as at Literna, *Beneventum* and *Caesarea* in Mauretania, public baths were the places where it was possible to admire old statues of deities. The establishment of museums of pagan statues in public squares is still rare in the late fourth century, when the choice of the *forum* for this function is evidenced only at Verona, but became perhaps more fashionable in the early fifth century. A collection of ancient statues was placed in the *Forum* at Rome in 416 and, sometime later, a similar decision was taken at *Beneventum*, where the example of Rome may have been imitated.

These public museums of ancient statues in the western part of the empire appear to be probably not very large and rather scattered; even a not especially significant town as Literna has one. Moreover, except for the collection of ancient statues in the *Forum* at Rome, with works of the most renowned classical Greek masters, the statues exhibited in these western collections probably did not include works of the famous sculptors of the glorious Greek past.

6. The removal of ancient works of art to Constantinople in late antiquity.

On the contrary, in the eastern part of the empire secular museums of ancient statues appear concentrated in the new capital, Constantinople.¹²⁷ They consisted of

¹²³ *CIL* 9. 1588: see Lepelley (n. 113) 11–2.

¹²⁴ *CIL* 9. 1563: see Lepelley (n. 113) 11.

¹²⁵ *CIL* 8. 20963; 20965 and 21078–9: see Lepelley (n. 113) 10–1.

¹²⁶ Evidence in Lepelley (n. 113) 12–3.

¹²⁷ I have studied the Constantinopolitan collections of antiquities thanks to a Fellowship of the British Academy for the Academic Year 1996/7. A museum of pagan statues is thought also to have existed at Alexandria towards the end of the fourth century, on the basis of Palladas, *Anthologia Graeca* 9.528 (for this opinion, see Lepelley (n. 113) 10 and 15, n. 49). However, Palladas is speaking in this epigram of the re-use of bronze statues of deities in a Christian building and not of their display in a secular museum and, moreover, the caption of this poem places this Christian building at Constantinople and not at Alexandria. Palladas had paid at least one visit to Constantinople, and his memory of people and monuments of that city can also be found in *Anthologia Graeca* 9.180–3, probably on the *Tycheum* of Constantinople; 292, an epigram addressed to Themistius, who was living in the new capital; and 16.207, an epigram probably dictated for the new base of the Praxitelean Eros of Parium, when this statue had been brought to Constantinople (see my book *Praxiteles*. 2 (n. 2) 157–63 and 208, n. 1839).

numerous, large and important collections, with some of the most important masterpieces of Classical Greece.

The removal of ancient statues from several rich centres of works of art in order to adorn Constantinople, at the time of the foundation of the new capital by Constantine, is well known thanks to the information provided by several writers.¹²⁸ It has also been studied comprehensively and analytically in important publications.¹²⁹

Eusebius and Socrates Scholasticus both attribute to Constantine the intention to de-sacralise these statues by removing them from their sanctuaries and displaying them in public places, thus discouraging the pagans from worshipping them.¹³⁰ Moreover, it is possible that Constantine wanted, in removing these statues, to give Constantinople the status of the city which epitomised the most glorious and creative moments of Greek and Roman civilisation, with the best of the visual arts of the past.¹³¹ In any case, as this city was by definition Christian, the ancient statues were admired specifically as works of art; Constantinople thus had secular museums.

The areas of Constantinople where the most important ancient statues, brought to the new capital already by the time of Constantine, were concentrated, are the following:

1. the Baths of Zeuxippus, where a rich collection of mainly bronze statues and also of some marble ones, is described in detail by Christodorus, writing in Constantinople around 500;¹³²
2. the Hippodrome;¹³³

¹²⁸ For the removal of ancient statues from several centres to Constantinople during the years in which this city was founded, the most important sources are: Hieronimus, *Chronica, ann.* 334; Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3.54.3; Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.16; Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.5; Zosimus, *Historia nova* 2.31; 5.24 and 41; Malalas 319.20–321.15; *Chronicon Paschale* 528–9; see also Th. Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanorum I.* (Leipzig 1901) 17–8 and 30–1; 2. (Leipzig 1907) 145–6; 204–5; and 257–78.

¹²⁹ The bibliography on this topic is rich. I cite here only: G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale, Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris 1974) 36–7; 139–40 and 324–7; idem, *Constantinople imaginaire, étude sur le recueil des «Patria»* (Paris 1984) 128–50; C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (ive–viii siècles)* (Paris 1985); H. Saradi-Mendelovici, «Christian Attitude toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and their Legacy in later Byzantine Centuries», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (44, 1990) 47–61; and P. Speck, «Urbs quam deo donavimus. Konstantins des Grossen Konzept fuer Konstantinopel», *Boreas* (18, 1995) 143–73.

¹³⁰ See the passages of these two writers cited at n. 128.

¹³¹ See especially the studies of Dagron and Mango cited at n. 129.

¹³² Christodorus, *Anthologia Graeca* 2.1–416; see also Julian Egyptian, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.325; moreover, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.112; Procopius, *De aedificiis* 1.10; Malalas 321; *Chronicon Paschale* 529; Cedrenus 1.647–8 and Zonaras 14.6. Three bases of statues and a fragment of a colossal female head in Pentelic marble, which is a fifth-century BC Attic work, have been found in these baths and are therefore the remnants of this collection: see R. Stupperich «Das Statuenprogramm in den Zeuxippos–Thermen. Ueberlegungen zur Beschreibung durch Christodoros von Koptos», *Instanbuler Mitteilungen* (32, 1982) 210–35 and S. Guberti Bassett, «*Historiae Custos: Sculpture and Tradition in the Baths of Zeuxippos*», *American Journal of Archaeology* (100, 1996) 491–506.

¹³³ Sources: Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3.54; Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.16; Zosimus, *Historia nova* 2.31.1; *Anthologia Graeca* 3.267; 9.755 and 777; 11.270–1; 15.41–50; 16.102 and 335–87; appendix 3.267; Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata, Descriptiones* 15.1–6 and 26.1–14; Malalas, 320–1; Preger (n. 128) 1.21; 39–42; 59–64; 69–71; 2.145–6; 172–3; 183; 189–92; 195–6; 278; Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De thematibus* 160.87; Suidas, s.v. *Basilike*; scholium to Strabo 6.278; Constantine Manasses, *Descriptio* 1.21–32; Nicetas Choniates, *De signis Constantinopolitanis* 156; 519 and 647–55; *Idem, De Manuele Comneno* 3.119.687; Robert de Clari 61–2; J. Spon, *Miscellanea eruditae antiquitatis* (Lyon 1685) 2.51; other testimonia after the Fourth Crusade can be

3. the Basilica, where the Heracles of Lysippus, after it had been removed from Rome, was first placed.¹³⁴
4. the *forum* of Constantine;¹³⁵
5. the *Augusteum* and the area nearby;¹³⁶
6. the Royal Portico, where bronze statues were set up;¹³⁷
7. the Great *Strategeum*;¹³⁸
8. the *forum Amastrianum*;¹³⁹
9. the *Exakionium*;¹⁴⁰
10. the street porticoes, which had statues in their upper floors;¹⁴¹
11. and finally perhaps the *thermae Constantinianae*.¹⁴²

It is possible that the decision to display collections of ancient statues in public squares, such as the *forum* of Constantine and the *Augusteum*, and in the public baths of

found in V.J. Menage, «The Serpent Column in Ottoman Sources», *Anatolian Studies* (14, 1964) 169–73; A. Guidi Toniato, «The Origins and Documentary Sources of the Horses of San Marco», in *The Horses of San Marco* (Venice 1979) 127–36; G. Majeska, *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Washington 1984) 144–84. Drawings are also important. See especially: O. Panvinio, *De ludis circensibus* (Venice 1600); E.A. Freshfield, «Notes on a Vellum Album containing some original Sketches of public Buildings and Monuments drawn by a German Artist who visited Constantinople in 1574», *Archaeologia* (62, 1922) 81–104; and P. Moreno, *Vita e arte di Lisippo* (Milan 1987) 237–57. Concerning the archaeological evidence, see S. Casson, «Les fouilles de l'Hippodrome de Constantinople», *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1930, April) 213–42. Antiquities that were represented at the beginning of the frieze on the column of Arcadius have often been also attributed to the collection of the Hippodrome. On this collection, see S. Guberti Bassett, «The Antiquities in the Hippodrome of Constantinople», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (45, 1991) 87–96.

¹³⁴ Sources: Suidas, *s.v. Basilike*; Preger (n. 128) 1.39–41 and 2.172. See Moreno (n. 133).

¹³⁵ Sources: Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3.48; Malalas 320; Philostorgius 1.34; Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiae* 1.34; Zonaras 3.18 B; Julian Egyptian, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.157; *Chronicon Paschale* 528; Preger (n. 128) 1.17–8; 25–6; 30–1; 33; 41–4; 55–6; 59; 66; 2. 138–9; 158–61; 173–4; 177–8; 201; 204–7; 217–8; 257; Constantine Rhodian, *Descriptiones* 156; Arethas, *scholium* to Aristides, *Orationes* 50.408.701.710 Dindorf; Cedrenus 1.518 and 564–6; Tzetzes, Chiliades 8. *Historiae* 333 and 338–9; Nicetas Choniates, *De signis Constantinopolitanis* 558–9 and 856. See Berger (n. 89).

¹³⁶ Sources: Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3.54; Zosimus, *Historia nova* 2.31.2–3 and 5.24.7–8; Johannes Lydus, *De mensibus* 4.75; Malalas 320–1; *Chronicon Paschale* 529; 593 and 621 and Preger (n. 128) 1.6; 16–8; 26–7; 104–5; 2.138–9 and 158–9. M. Vickers, «Constantinopolis», *LIMC* (3, 1986) 301–4; G. Buehl, *Constantinopolis und Roma. Stadtpersonifikationen der Späantike* (Liverpool 1995) 10–1 and 21–40 and Berger (n. 89).

¹³⁷ *Chronicon Paschale* 710; Preger (n. 128) 1.51; and 2.164–6; and Cedrenus 1.616.

¹³⁸ *Chronicon Paschale* 495B; Preger (n. 128) 1.7; 17; 33–4; 66; 2.138; 141; 183–4; 218–21 and 306; and Cedrenus 1.563.

¹³⁹ Leo Grammaticus, *Chronica* 253B; Preger (n. 128) 1.46–8; 2.179–80; 203 and 269; Cedrenus 1.566 and 679B; and Manuel Chrysoloras, *Patrologia Graeca* 156.48.

¹⁴⁰ Preger (n. 128) 1.32 and 2.180–2 (the latter passage would suggest the monumentalization of the *exakionium* by Constantine).

¹⁴¹ Manuel Chrysoloras, *Patrologia Graeca* 156.41.

¹⁴² Sources: Themistius, *Orationes* 13; *Chronicon Paschale* 534; and Preger (n. 128) 1.54; 67 and 71–2; and 2.195. See W. Mueller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls* (Tuebingen 1977) 20; 48 and 273. These baths, begun by Constantine (see Preger (n. 128) 1.67 and 2.195), were continued by Constantius II from 345 onwards (see *Chronicon Paschale* 534).

Constantinople, influenced later similar choices in western centres, such as those considered above.

After Constantine, the display of statues in the *forum bovis*¹⁴³ as well as in the *thermae Constantinianae*, may have been arranged during the reign of Constantius II, as a continuation of Constantine's programme of collecting ancient statues in public areas of the new city.

A new collection was formed with the construction of the imperial palace of Hebdomon, just outside the city and in use from at least 364, suggesting that it had been decided upon probably by Julian between 361 and 363. The facades of two buildings of this palace on the main road were adorned with several statues, and were represented on the frieze of the column of Theodosius, erected between 386 and 393 and which is no longer extant. However, the relevant section of this frieze is visible in the Accard drawings, attributed to Gentile Bellini, kept in the Louvre, Paris, no. 4951. Among the several statues represented as standing on the facades of those two buildings of the palace, there is an Eros with his bow of the Verona/Kifissia type, to be identified probably with Lysippus' Eros from Myndus in southern Ionia, and an Aphrodite of the Capitoline type, which may be identified with the Aphrodite made by Cephisodotus the Younger and displayed at Rome, among the *Pollionis Asini monumenta*, during Augustan and later imperial times.¹⁴⁴

It is hardly surprising that Julian, so favourable to the promotion of pagan tradition, wanted to set up statues of deities in front of the new imperial palace. In any case, the decision to display pagan statues in an imperial palace may have been thought by this emperor to give appropriate emphasis to his own religious beliefs.

Theodosius, who, as mentioned above, together with Gratian and Valentinian II, had endorsed the need to distinguish between the *artis pretium* and the *divinitas* of pagan statues, had also adorned his own *forum Tauri* at Constantinople with antiquities.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, the hippodrome was adorned with an obelisk, Lysippus' Heracles was removed from the Basilica, perhaps because of the sacrifices made to him there, and brought to the hippodrome, probably in the same period,¹⁴⁶ and antiquities were re-used in the *anemodoulion*, perhaps also in these years.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴³ See Preger (n. 128) 1.48–9 and 54; 2.180 and Cedrenus 1.566 and 679.

¹⁴⁴ See F. Menestrier, *Columna Theodosiana* (Paris 1702) pl. 2; G. Becatti, *La colonna coelide istoriata* (Rome 1960) 121–5; Moreno (n. 133) 97–100; and my article «L'Afrodite Capitolina e l'arte di Cefisodoto il Giovane», *Numismatica e Antichità Classiche. Quaderni Ticinesi* (21, 1992) 131–57.

¹⁴⁵ Sources: Marcellinus Comes, *Patrologia Latina* 51.924C–927D; Theophanes 70; *Chronicon Paschale* 565; 570 and 574; Preger (n. 128) 1.30; 51–2; 57–8; 64–5; 2.148–9; 164–6; 170–1; 175–7; 184–5; 204; 216; 221; 248; 254; 264; 277–8; Cedrenus 1.566; Nicetas Choniates, *De signis Constantinopolitanis* 856B. See L. Faedo, «Il complesso monumentale del foro di Teodosio a Costantinopoli», *Corsi Ravenna* (29, 1982) 159–68 and Eadem, «Teodosio, Temistio e l'ideologia erculea nella nea Rome. A proposito dell'arco del forum tauri», *Roemische Mitteilungen* (105, 1998) 315–28.

¹⁴⁶ On the setting of the obelisk in the hippodrome, see Julian, *Epistulae* 2.59.443 B; *CIL* 3.737; Marcellinus Comes, *Patrologia Latina* 51.919; Nicetas Paphlagonius, *Vita S. Ignatii* 5.989; Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De caerimoniis* 1.69.310 and 72.360. See Guberti Bassett (n. 133). On the removal of Lysippus' Heracles from the basilica to the hippodrome, Preger (n. 128) 1.64; see Moreno (n. 133).

¹⁴⁷ See Vita S. Andreae 105; Constantine Rhodian, *Descriptiones* 178–201; Preger (n. 128) 2.253; Cedrenus 1.555; 565–6; and 616; and Nicetas Choniates, *De signis Constantinopolitanis* 856–7 B. This building was founded by Theodosius I (see Cedrenus 1.565–6) and later renovated at the beginning of the eighth

Finally, during the last years of his reign, a museum with some of the most important masterpieces of classical Greece was established: it was therefore possible to view them even after the closure of the pagan temples decreed in 392. This museum was situated in the so-called *Lauseum*.¹⁴⁸

This collection is very well known from the account given by Cedrenus, whose *Compendium historiarum* was written towards the end of the eleventh century. Moreover, the coherent arrangement of the statues inside the building makes this institution the one which most resembles a real museum of all the collections of this era. For these reasons, and for the exceptional importance of the masterpieces brought there, the *Lauseum* must be examined further.

The building is said by the Pseudo-Codinus, written *ca.* 1100, to have been one of the twelve palaces of Constantine, who must have built it around 330: it was therefore an imperial property. Pseudo-Codinus gives a list of marble pieces re-used in the palace, probably in the time of Constantine:

1. pediments;
2. paterae, used as spouts of water pipes through bronze statuettes and marble ivy leaves;
3. thresholds;
4. and square altars, re-used as fountains, for public use.¹⁴⁹

During the last years of the reign of Theodosius, one part of this palace was transformed into a museum. Cedrenus includes this museum in the context of his description of Constantinople at the end of the reign of this emperor.¹⁵⁰ He lists six works, which follow probably the sequence of their display. The six seem to have been divided into smaller groups of two statues each, according to the region of their provenance. Moreover, in each group of two statues the more ancient one precedes the more recent.

The first group includes two works from Dorian Asia Minor: an archaic statue, the Athena Lindia of Dipoenus and Scyllis, and a late classical one, the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles.

The second group consisted of two works from Ionia: an archaic statue of Hera from Samus, probably by Athenis and Bupalus, and the late classical statue of Eros from

century (see Preger (n. 128) 2.253). The bronze slabs, carved with reliefs and removed from Dyrachium, where they had been elements of a pagan temple, are likely to have been brought to Constantinople at the time of the first construction of this building.

¹⁴⁸ On the *Lauseum*, see G. Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, etc. (n. 129); A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinopoleos* (Bonn 1988) 284–7; my book *Praxiteles*. 3 (n. 2) 128–42; C. Mango, M. Vickers and E.D. Francis, «The Palace of Lausus at Constantinople and its Collection of ancient Statues», *Journal of the History of Collections* (4, 1992) 89–98; J. Bardill, «The Palace of Lausus and nearby Monuments in Constantinople: a topographical Study», *American Journal of Archaeology* (101, 1997) 67–95; and Guberti Bassett (n. 29). On this building, the sources are numerous and sometimes very detailed. See Philostorgius 3.11; *Chronicon Paschale* 852 and 972–3; Victorius Tunensis, *Chronica* 951A; Teophanes 184 and 239; Leo Grammaticus, *Chronica* 467d, 248B; Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus, *De caerimoniis* 1.39.165; Preger (n. 128) 2.147–8; 160; 170 and 286; Cedrenus 1.564 and 616; Zonaras 14.24.2.52d.

¹⁴⁹ See Pseudo-Codinus, *Patria Constantinopoleos* 2.36.27.B.37–8.170 Preger: see Berger (n. 148).

¹⁵⁰ Cedrenus 1.564.

Myndus, attributed to Lysippus,¹⁵¹ probably removed from the sculptural collection of the imperial palace of Hebdomon (see above).

Finally, the third couple of works were Peloponnesian: the Zeus of Phidias from Olympia, i.e. the most famous early classical masterpiece of Greece, and a late classical statue, the Kairos of Lysippus, which had previously been seen at Sicyon by Callistratus.¹⁵²

After these six statues, Cedrenus mentions exotic and rare animals and mythical bestial beings as being displayed here: the inclusion of statues and *mirabilia* of nature in the same collection may be explained by an interest in even the statues as «curiosities».

Philostorgius, in a passage of his *Historia ecclesiastica* written a little after 425 and known only through a summary given by Photius, appears to clarify what these animals were. He informs us that, although the Unicorn does not live in the Mediterranean world, it is possible to see an example (*ektypoma*) at Constantinople.¹⁵³ He writes also that a bull–elephant had been brought into the empire, where he saw it, and that a Pan, thought to be a type of monkey, had been presented by the king of India to Constantius II and kept in a crate far from Constantinople. It was embalmed when it died. He also mentions that he has seen other rare animals in the empire. Philostorgius' list pretty much coincides with the list of Cedrenus: only the tigers and the Centauri, included by the latter writer among the animals displayed in the *Lauseum*, are not mentioned by Philostorgius. These figures at the *Lauseum* were thus models (*ektypomata*) of exotic animals.

Philostorgius probably refers to them and is therefore the probable source of the catalogue given by Cedrenus. The paratactical order which characterises Cedrenus' list of these figures suggests that they were placed one after the other along a passageway through the museum.

The residential quarter of the palace was inhabited, during the reigns of Arcadius and Theodosius II, by the *patricius* and *praepositus sacri cubiculi* Lausus,¹⁵⁴ who, as it is known from Pseudo–Codinus, had increased the monumental nature of the palace, providing it with three different types of columns:

1. white marble columns;
2. columns with different colours;
3. small columns made of precious materials.¹⁵⁵

The use of a quarter of the *Lauseum* as the residence of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* did not affect accessibility to the figures exhibited in the museum, presumably because

¹⁵¹ The passage of Cedrenus concerning the second couple of statues is thought to have been corrupted and the attributions of these two statues to individual sculptors is due to amendments (for a discussion on this problem, see my book *Prassitele*. 3 (n. 2) 197, n. 2549).

¹⁵² For the probable times and circumstances of the removal of these statues from their previous settings, see the discussion in my *Prassitele*. 3 (n. 2) 128–40 and 195–200, ns. 2522–614, as well as in the article *ad hoc* of Guberti Bassett (n. 29).

¹⁵³ Philostorgius 3.11: see my commentary, cited at n. 152.

¹⁵⁴ On the personality of Lausus, see the article of Mango, Vickers and Francis (n. 148).

¹⁵⁵ See n. 149.

they were kept in another part of the building: in fact, Philostorgius invites his readers to see the *ektypoma* of the Unicorn around 425, when Lausus was there.

The quarter of the *Lauseum* used as a museum was destroyed by the large fire of 476.¹⁵⁶ The residential quarter, with its marble elements, survived the fire and was still standing in the time of Pseudo-Codinus. It was most likely destroyed during the sack of Constantinople in 1204, as it is not mentioned as extant after this time.¹⁵⁷

The collection of the *Lauseum* represents probably the most important episode of the effort of the Roman/Christian Empire to preserve and make available the sculptural heritage of ancient Greece, evaluated from a purely artistic point of view.

The visitor to this museum was able to admire some of the best examples of Greek sculpture. To put the works included in this collection into a historical sequence, there were statues by two archaic masters, as well as Phidias' most important masterpiece, Praxiteles' most famous statue and finally two statues of Lysippus, Alexander's beloved bronze sculptor. If we were to consider this collection from the perspective of the sculptural schools represented, one work must be attributed to the Daedalic school (the Athena of Dipoenus and Scyllis), another to the Ionian school (the Hera of Athenis and Boupalus), two to the Attic school (the two masterpieces of Phidias and Praxiteles), and two to the Sicyonian/Peloponnesian school (the two statues of Lysippus). If we consider the materials used in these statues, bronze sculpture was represented with two works (the two of Lysippus), marble sculpture with another two creations (probably the Hera of Athenis and Boupalus and the Aphrodite Cnidia), sculpture in precious materials with another two statues (the Athena of Lindus made of emerald stone and the Zeus of Phidias made of ivory; Cedrenus does not mention the gold used in this latter sculpture, perhaps because the gold elements had been already removed and reused prior to the foundation of the museum). If we consider these statues from the point of view of their subjects, we have Zeus, the most important god, the three goddesses of the judgement of Paris (Hera, Athena and Aphrodite), Eros (whom a long tradition regarded as the real ruler of all the world), and Kairos, regarded from the time of New Comedy as the lord of destiny.¹⁵⁸ An idyllic interpretation of classical mythology was therefore confirmed by the selection of these statues of deities.

In fact, in the selection of these statues, it is possible to sense the influence of a literary education. The myth of Daedalus¹⁵⁹ may have led to the choice of a statue attributed to his two most important students, Dipoenus and Scyllis.¹⁶⁰ Athenis and especially Boupalus were renowned by connoisseurs of Greek poetry, primarily because of their quarrel with an important poet, Hipponax.¹⁶¹ Phidias and Praxiteles were

¹⁵⁶ Cedrenus 1.616 and Zonaras 14.24.2.52.

¹⁵⁷ These conclusions, together with the evidence supporting them, can be found in my book *Prassiteles*. 3 (n. 148).

¹⁵⁸ Mango, Vickers and Francis (n. 148) have rightly insisted on the importance of the subjects represented in order to explain the selection of the statues included in this collection.

¹⁵⁹ See nn. 37 and 43.

¹⁶⁰ The studentship of these two sculptors under Daedalus is known by Pausanias 2.15.1.

¹⁶¹ See Hipponax, frgg. 1–6; 17–20; 70; 77; 86; 98; 121 and 144 Degani; Callimachus, *Jambi* 1. frg. 191 Pf.; Horace, *Epodi* 6.13–4; Acron, *scholium ad locum*; *scholium gamma b ad locum*; Porphyryon, *scholium ad locum*; *scholium lambda phi psi ad locum*; *scholium* codd. Pariss. 8223 and 17897 *ad locum*; Ovid, *Ibis* 521–4; Philippus,

considered by a very long tradition as the best Attic sculptors of statues of deities of the classical period.¹⁶² Moreover, the Zeus of Olympia was counted among the seven wonders of the world.¹⁶³ The Cnidian Aphrodite was well-established and gossiped about, even by Church Fathers such as Clement and Arnobius, because of the love of a youth for this statue, and it had been celebrated as renowned by Ausonius, a Christian court poet well known to Theodosius.¹⁶⁴ Lysippus was closely related in a long tradition with Alexander the Great, i.e. to a personality known to everybody; moreover the Kairos was perhaps the most famous work of this sculptor, which he had indeed given to Alexander.¹⁶⁵

Finally, it is possible to argue from Cedrenus' account of this collection that at least some of the statues were regarded as important symbols of a glorious past, i.e. of Greece in a golden age: perhaps not by chance the Zeus of Olympia is attributed by Cedrenus to the patronage of Pericles.

The determination to save the most significant ancient Greek statues and to guarantee the continuity of their visibility reaches its peak in the Theodosian period, in the very years when the pagan temples were closed and the concept of *artis pretium* is made distinct from that of *divinitas*.

During the fifth and sixth century, collections of ancient statues were formed and supplemented in Constantinople. This was however due to the continuity of an already-established tradition rather than the result of any new impetus: the will to give these works a setting at the heart of the empire appears indeed to diminish as time goes on. It is possible that the distance between current and ancient taste, discussed above, played a decisive role in the development of a sense of apathy towards ancient works of art.

However Arcadius may also have decorated his new *forum* in Constantinople, known as Xerolophus, with a few antiquities,¹⁶⁶ in order to emulate Constantine and Theodosius, whose *fora* had been adorned with ancient works of art.

Anthologia Graeca 7.405; Pliny 36.11–3; Lucian, *Pseudologista* 2 and Suidas, *s.v.* Hipponax. As Boupalus and Athenis were members of a very renowned school of marble sculptors from Chios (see especially Pliny's passage, above), it is likely that this Hera from Samos was also a work made in marble. Boupalus had made at least one statue with gold (see Pausanias 9.36.5), but Pliny's observation that marble sculpture seems to have been the specialization of this school, suggesting that gold was worked only episodically, and Cedrenus' specification when statues had been made in previous materials (see the cases of the Athena Lindia, which is said to have been made of emerald stone, and of the Zeus of Olympia, the original ivory material of which is mentioned) make it likely that this Hera was made of marble and not gold.

¹⁶² See n. 16 and T. Pekary, «Das Griechische Plastik in den Roemischen Rhetorenschulen», *Boreas* (12, 1989) 95–104.

¹⁶³ See K. Brodersen, *Die sieben Weltwunder* (Munich 1996) 9–20 and 58–69.

¹⁶⁴ See Clement, *Protrepticus ad Graecos* 4.51 and Arnobius, *Adversus gentes* 6.22. On this episode of *agalmatophilia*, see bibl. in n. 63. Ausonius had celebrated the Cnidia in *Epigrammata* 62 Green. On the relationship of Ausonius with Theodosius, see Green (ed. 1999) (n. 87) x–xi; xvi; xix; and xxv–xxvi.

¹⁶⁵ On the relationship of Lysippus with Alexander the Great, see P. Moreno, *Lisippo. L'arte e la fortuna* (Milan 1995) 35–8; 148–65; 169–79 and 331–46. On the Kairos as a statue made by Lysippus for Alexander the Great, see above, section two, and nn. 28–9.

¹⁶⁶ See Theophanes 77; 222 and 226; Marcellinus Comes, *Patrologia Latina* 51.926A; *Chronicon Paschale* 579 and Preger (n. 128) 1.32 and 67; 2.160–1; 176–7; 180; 207 and 270. It is however unclear whether and how many of these antiquities were set up by Septimius Severus, who had formerly set up monuments in this area, or when the transformation of the site into a square was decided upon by Arcadius (see Dagron and Mango, cited at n. 129).

Moreover, Theodosius II had reused antiquities in the Golden Gate that he had built,¹⁶⁷ as well as on the *Boucoleum*,¹⁶⁸ thus paying homage to the established tradition of associating new architectural and urban creations with ancient works of art. He also added to the collection of the hippodrome.¹⁶⁹

However, these new displays of antiquities no longer appear inspired by the desire to make ancient works of art *per se* viewable, but rather by decorative and ornamental needs.

The Athena Promachus of Phidias was removed from Athens and taken to the *forum* of Constantine in Constantinople a little after 462.¹⁷⁰ It is possible that the colossal dimensions of this statue satisfied the «baroque» sensibility of the early Byzantines and their enjoyment of the imposing and «shocking».¹⁷¹

This statue was set up on a column, beside another ancient statue of a sea goddess that had been brought from Rhodes.¹⁷² Both these works embellished the frontal *propylum* of the Senate House in the *forum* of Constantine, one being placed on each side of the entrance. The function of these statues at Constantinople was therefore first of all a decorative one, consequential to a consideration of ancient masterpieces as figures appropriated to increase the scenic impact of the facades of important palaces. Another possible reason for the presence of these statues in front of the Senate House of the *forum* of Constantine may have been to underline the old tradition of the Constantinopolitan Senate as an institution which was in fact the continuation of the Roman Senate. In this way, then, the Constantinople Senate was the inheritor of the glorious political institutions of the ancient Greek states: in other words, the Greek institutions of Pericles' days may have been regarded as antecedents of the imperial institutions of

¹⁶⁷ Sources: Theophanes 412; Preger (n. 128) 2.150 and 182–3; Cedrenus 1.567; Zonaras 3.267B; Harun B. Jahja 206 and 215 Marquart, and Robert de Clari 69. See W. Wheeler, *The Golden Gate of Constantinople* (Warminster 1978) (for the old drawings of this monument, 238–42).

¹⁶⁸ Sources: Theophanes 447B; Leo Diaconus 64B; Preger (n. 128) 2.256; Cedrenus 2.369–70; Nicetas Choniates, *De signis Constantinopolitanis* 451B; see Mueller–Wiener (n. 142) 225–8.

¹⁶⁹ See Preger (n. 128) 1.71 (on the removal from Chius of the four gilded horses placed above the hippodrome (see Cameron and Herrin (n. 48) 273–4) and 2.183.

¹⁷⁰ See the *testimonia* of Julian Egyptian, Constantine Rhodian, Cedrenus and Nicetas Choniates cited in n. 135 (on Arethas' *scholium*, also n. 101), as well as the following modern contributions: R.J.H. Jenkins, «The bronze Athena at Byzantium», *JHS* (57, 1947) 31–3; A. Frantz, *Late Antiquity: AD 267–700* (Princeton 1988) 76–7; R.H.W. Stichel, «Eine Athena des Phidias in Konstantinopel?», *Boreas* (11, 1988) 155–64; A. Linfert, «Keine Athena des Phidias in Konstantinopel?», *ibid.* (12, 1989) 137–40; and B. Lundgreen, «A methodological Enquiry: the Great Bronze Athena by Pheidias», *JHS* (117, 1997) 190–7. I do not share the widespread scepticism as regards the presence of this statue at Constantinople, as its presence in front of the *propylum* of the senate–house in the *forum Constantini* is stated clearly by Arethas. Moreover, Julian Egyptian already seems to refer to this statue as set up at Constantinople and the description of the colossal statue in the *forum Constantini* by Nicetas Choniates also seems in keeping with the iconography of the Promachus.

¹⁷¹ This taste can be fully appreciated especially through the appreciative account of the colossal bronze equestrian statue of Justinian that stood in the *Augusteum* of Constantinople given by Procopius of Caesarea, *De aedificiis* 1.2 and 10 (see S. Sande, «The equestrian Statue of Justinian and the Schema Achilleion», *Acta ad archaeologiam et artis historiam pertinentia* (6, 1987) 91–111.

¹⁷² On this statue, see especially Arethas, *scholium* to Aristides, *Orationes* 50.408.701.710 Dindorf and Cedrenus 565a, and the bibliography cited in n. 170.

Constantinople. Statues by Phidias would in particular have been considered as symbols of that past.¹⁷³

Finally, the Cow of Myron was brought to Constantinople from the *forum Pacis* of Rome probably in 546 or little after, when the Byzantines took Rome from the Goths.¹⁷⁴ The well-known function of the iconography of the cow as a symbol of prosperity after a victory¹⁷⁵ supplies a reason for the removal of Myron's masterpiece; it was therefore regarded as a war trophy. Moreover, since it had been standing on the Acropolis of Athens before being taken to Rome, Myron's Cow could have also been regarded as an appropriate visual expression of the idea that Constantinople had inherited the glories of both Athens and Rome.¹⁷⁶ Finally, statues of animals seem to have been popular in Constantinople,¹⁷⁷ perhaps as a consequence of the decline of the influence of classical anthropocentrism and also because they were in tune with the taste for suggesting large, open environments in the visual arts.¹⁷⁸

In fact, Julian the Egyptian towards 550, praises Myron's Cow in his epigrams precisely because of its naturalistic appearance, which suggests to the viewer's imagination a countryside landscape.¹⁷⁹ A similar reason had earlier been given for praising this statue in many poems on this figure composed during Hellenistic and Roman times.¹⁸⁰ Already by these periods, Myron's Cow had been considered a good example of the artist's power to translate the life of nature into a work of art. This concept of beauty was very different from the notion of beauty resulting from studies of *rhythmos* and the numerical relations among the various parts of a figure, so admired in antiquity in the statues of Polyclitus and other classical masters.¹⁸¹ On the contrary, during the era of Justinian, the classical Greek work of art which excites, more than any other, a deeply felt admiration is therefore, not by chance, the same statue that had previously suggested, to many generations of ancient viewers, an idea of beauty very

¹⁷³ Cedrenus 564c links Phidias to Pericles as sculptor and patron respectively of the Zeus of Olympia.

¹⁷⁴ Procopius from Caesarea, *De bello Gothico* 8.21.14 had seen this statue still standing at Rome, in the *forum Pacis*, in the years 537–8 (see K. Gantar, «Procope et les statues du Forum Pacis à Rome», *Arheoloski Vestnik* (19, 1968) 189–93). However, Julian Egyptian, *Anthologia Graeca* 9.793–8, saw it at Constantinople no later than 550, as his long poetical production is dated from 490 to 550 (see A. Cameron, «The House of Anastasius», *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* (19, 1978) 259–76): so, Myron's masterpiece must have been removed from Rome and brought to Constantinople probably in the 540s. The Byzantine conquest of Rome in 546 is therefore of course the most likely historical antecedent of that removal. After Julian, Constantine Manasses, *Descriptio* 1.21–32.75 Sternbach expressed interest in this statue around 1150 and Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 8. *historiae* 363–5 wrote on it in the third quarter of the 12th century. This statue was probably destroyed during the sack of Constantinople of 1204. On all these problems, see my article «La vacca di Mirone», *Numismatica e antichità classiche. Quaderni Ticinesi* (23, 1994) 49–91.

¹⁷⁵ See the considerations and the bibliography supporting this conclusion in my article cited at n. 174.

¹⁷⁶ Tzetzes (n. 174) underlines that this statue, so famous in his days, had previously stood on the Acropolis of Athens, connecting therefore classical Athens with Constantinople.

¹⁷⁷ See especially sources and bibliography cited at nn. 133; 135; 143 and 145, concerning ancient statues in the hippodrome, as well as in the *fora* of Constantine, *bovis* and *tauri*.

¹⁷⁸ See the bibliography on Byzantine ekphraseis given in n. 92.

¹⁷⁹ See Julian's epigrams cited in n. 174.

¹⁸⁰ See the list of these poems given in my article (n. 174).

¹⁸¹ On the idea of beauty expressed by Polyclitus according to ancient art criticism, see P. Bol (ed.), *Polyklet* (Frankfurt am Main 1990) 48–9; 121–56 and 185–98.

distant from the rhythmical one prevailing in ancient art criticism.¹⁸² Indeed, the most frequent reason for praising mosaics and paintings in the Byzantine ekphrasis, i.e. that these representations seem endowed with the life of nature, may have been thought to apply also to the Cow of Myron.

After Justinian, there is no evidence that new collections of ancient statues were established, no doubt because the idea that the classical heritage was an important component of Christian civilisation no longer prevails during the so-called Byzantine «dark age».¹⁸³

7. Some additional observations.

a. The rise of the idea that the surfaces of classical Greek marble statues had the same colour as their marbles and were therefore not painted.

This idea seems to be the result of a long process. An important step in this direction may lie in the theory, asserted by the Academic philosopher Carneades (in Cicero, *De divinatione* 1.13.24 and 2.1.48), that statues already exist inside the quarries and that they need sculptors merely to remove the superfluous material. This concept of stone sculpture conceived as a discovery rather than as a creation is stressed again by Pliny at 36.14. It involves, of course, the idea that the painting of colours onto the surfaces of these statues was not considered an important operation, as the stone statues could be thought to be finished just by removing the superfluous material.

The first explicit reference to statues whose appearances show the white colour of the marble is found, as far as I know, in Lucian's *Jupiter tragoedus* 10, as early as around 165 AD; the shining marble surface of the Cnidian Aphrodite is admired in the *Amores* 15, also attributed to Lucian.¹⁸⁴ Finally, the observation that the colour of the surface of a marble statue is the same as the marble used can be found in Byzantine writers.¹⁸⁵

In my opinion, three considerations may contribute to explain the establishment of this belief:

1. The colours given usually to sandals, drapery, hair, eyes and attributes of Greek classical marble statues and the transparent waxes smeared on the naked parts of many important, especially late-classical, *agalmata*¹⁸⁶ may have been worn away in many cases

¹⁸² See Schweitzer, Pollitt and Isager, cited at n. 44.

¹⁸³ The approach to ancient works of art by Byzantine viewers between the sixth and ninth centuries can be argued especially from the *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai* of the early eighth century (see ns. 48 and 97), where ancient statues are often considered: the main reason for this interest was the magical power attributed to ancient pagan works.

¹⁸⁴ I support the attribution of this dialogue to Lucian: see my article «Praxiteles and Parian marble», in D. Schilardi (ed.), *Paria Lithos* (in print).

¹⁸⁵ See, e.g. Cedrenus 564b and Tzetzes, *Chiliades 8. historiae* 371.

¹⁸⁶ *Loci classici* on these operations are Pliny 35.122 and 133 (in the latter passage, he refers to the painter Nicias who had given the *circumlitio* to the best statues of Praxiteles). On the polychromy of ancient Greek statues, see V. Manzelli, *La policromia nella statuaria greca arcaica* (Rome 1994), with a good earlier bibliography.

by the second century AD and may have not always been restored by the curators of sanctuaries during Roman times.¹⁸⁷

2. It is likely that most Roman marble copies of Greek classical statues were not painted or smeared with wax. This may have happened as a matter of course, especially in the frequent cases when marble copies had been taken from bronze originals, as there was no point in adding colours or waxes that did not exist in the bronze originals.¹⁸⁸

If we consider that the marble copies set up in Roman times must have been far more numerous than the Greek originals, it is then possible that the habit of continually seeing the forms of the classical masterpieces in colourless copies led to the belief that classical marble sculpture was a colourless art.

3. It is probable that the Platonic assertion that the Ideas do not have colours¹⁸⁹ and the middle-imperial Platonising claim that the wise *agalmatopoiia* would aim at reacquiring these ethereal archetypes (see section one above) promoted the concept that the optimum statue was colourless. It may, therefore, be the case that both the debate on the wise *agalmatopoiia* and the notion of classical marble statues as colourless came to a head in the context of the Second Sophistic culture of the late second and early third century AD.

b. The theory that statues were more important than paintings in classical Greece.

Platonism may also have contributed to the establishment of this theory. Plato himself seems to have had a more negative opinion of painting than of sculpture, probably because of the illusionist nature of the former.¹⁹⁰

During the Second Sophistic period, three trends may have led to the formation of such a theory:

1. The debate on the supposed religious value of classical works (see sections one, two and three above) resulted inevitably in greater attention being given to statues than to paintings, as many statues were regarded as idols and cult practices were addressed to them.

2. The consideration of *agalmatopoiia* as a wise art, which can create, through the imagination, plausible interpretations of the deities (see section one above).

3. The physical consistency of the statues and the fact that they occupy their own space, distinct from the spaces of any other object, permitted, in the spiritualistic culture of the period from the Severans onwards, the formation of the theory that they may become epiphanies of the divine subjects represented, who are able to dwell within these material bodies (see section 2 of this article).

¹⁸⁷ In the case of the Cnidian Aphrodite, the waxes given by Nicias on the naked parts of the goddess (see n. 186) may have worn out by the second century AD, if we note the bright colour of the marble in Lucian's *Amores* 15, so the statue was therefore no longer altered by the waxes smeared on its surface.

¹⁸⁸ On the procedure of making marble copies of bronze originals in Roman Imperial times, see C. Landwehr, *Die antiken Gypsabgüsse aus Baiäe* (Berlin 1985) and C. Gasparri, «L'officina dei calchi di Baiä», *Roemische Mitteilungen* (102, 1995) 173–87.

¹⁸⁹ See the passages cited at n. 38 and the bibliography cited at n. 5.

¹⁹⁰ See bibliography cited at n. 5.

In fact, the prevalence of interest in the statues rather than the paintings of classical Greece is clearly shown in the collection of ekphrastic poems on ancient works of art in the *Greek Anthology*,¹⁹¹ by the Church Fathers (section three above), as well as by several Second Sophistic writers from around 200 AD. These include Callistratus, Alciphron, Aelian, Diogenes Laertius and Athenaeus up until Himerius, Libanius, Julian and Ausonius.¹⁹²

The probability that far more sculptures than paintings of the classical period had survived until the third and fourth centuries AD must have contributed to the spread of this idea. The idea of the prevalence of statues over paintings in classical Greece is therefore mature already around 200 AD: the Platonizing Second Sophistic pagan writers preferred statues to paintings for reasons 2 and 3 given above; the Christian writers then appropriated this hierarchy.

This concept was regarded as obvious already when, from the age of Constantine to that of Theodosius, collections of ancient statues, and not of ancient paintings, were assembled in order to preserve the pagan artistic heritage (sections five and six above).

c. The establishment of a gentle, hedonistic and idealistic interpretation of classical art.

The notion of classical art as an art of pleasure, full of beautiful Aphrodites, Erotes and other mythological figures living in a world of fables, speaking a language of seduction and dominated by sensual excitement and especially by love, appears, in neo-sophistic culture, already from the late second century AD onwards.¹⁹³ It can also be observed in the collection of epigrams describing ancient works of art included in the *Greek Anthology*¹⁹⁴ and is accepted by the Church Fathers, who, of course, condemned the hedonism of this art (section three above). Again, it is possible that Platonism, which had dominated middle- and late imperial culture, imposed its idealised and sublime concept of ancient art.

Antonio Corso

12, Thiseos

Vari - Varkiza

Athens GR-16 672

¹⁹¹ *Anthologia Graeca* 16, section 4: see Fuá (n. 111), Schwarz (n. 46) and my article (n. 86).

¹⁹² On Callistratus, see section two of this article. See also the passages of Alciphron, Aelian, Diogenes Laertius, Himerius, Libanius and Julian cited at n. 31, Athenaeus 13.585–91, and the epigrams of Ausonius cited at n. 110.

¹⁹³ See n. 51.

¹⁹⁴ See n. 191.