


ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

Τόμ. 3 (2002)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 3 (2002)



**Classical, not Classicistic Thoughts on the origins
of «Classicizing Roman Sculpture»**

Antonio Corso

doi: [10.12681/eul.32740](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.32740)

ΤΟΜΟΣ 3

ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ
ΡΕΘΥΜΝΟ 2002

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

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

Τόμος 3
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2002

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ

ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ

ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ

Π. Μανουσάκη 5–Β. Χάλη 8

GR 741 00–Ρέθυμνο

ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ–ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)

Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Βόλος)

ΒΟΗΘΟΣ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Δήμητρα Τσαγκάρη

PUBLISHER

MEDITERRANEAN

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

P. Manousaki 5–V. Chali 8

GR 741 00–Rethymno

PUBLISHING DIRECTORS–EDITORS

Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymno)

Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Bolos)

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITORS

Dr. Dimitra Tsangari

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ

Καθ. Πέτρος Θέμελης (Ρέθυμνο)
 Καθ. Νίκος Σταμπολίδης (Ρέθυμνο)
 Δρ. Alan W. Johnston (Λονδίνο)
 Καθ. François Lefèvre (Παρίσι)
 Καθ. Άγγελος Χανιώτης (Χαϊδελβέργη)
 Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Βόλος)
 Δρ. Ιωάννης Τουράτσογλου (Αθήνα)
 Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)
 Καθ. Σοφία Καμπίτση (Ρέθυμνο)
 Καθ. Αναγνώστης Αγγελαράκης (Νέα Υόρκη)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymno)
 Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymno)
 Dr. Alan W. Johnston (London)
 Prof. François Lefèvre (Paris)
 Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Heidelberg)
 Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Volos)
 Dr. Ioannis Touratsoglou (Athens)
 Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymno)
 Prof. Sofie Kambitsis (Rethymno)
 Prof. Anagnostis Agelarakis (New York)

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 Υστερομινωική / Υπομινωική / 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, Ζωοαρχαιολογία, 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 επδέχονται 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 Λίτινας, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100

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

EULIMENE is a refereed 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, palaiodemography, 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
EYΛIMENH 3 (2002)

List of contents
EULIMENE 3 (2002)

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti	6
Antonio Corso , Classical, not Classicistic: Thoughts on the origins of «Classicizing Roman Sculpture»	11
Antonios Kotsonas , The rise of the polis in central Crete	37
Μαρία Σταυροπούλου-Γάτση, Γεωργία Ζ. Αλεξοπούλου , ΑΝΑΚΤΟΡΙΟ – ΑΚΤΙΟ ΑΚΑΡΝΑΝΙΑΣ. Συμβολή στη μελέτη της οχύρωσης της πόλης του Ανακτορίου και στην τοπογραφία της ευρύτερης περιοχής	75
David Jordan , Κατάδεσμος από τον Κεραμικό Αθηνών	95
Πάυλος Χρυσοστόμου , Συμβολές στην ιστορία της ιατρικής στην αρχαία Μακεδονία	99
Eva Apostolou , Rhodes hellénistique. Les trésors et la circulation monétaire	117
Robert C. Knapp , Greek Mercenaries, Coinage and Ideology	183
Nahum Cohen , A Poll-tax Receipt	197
David Jordan , Άλλο ένα παράδειγμα του Ψαλμού 90.1	201
Άννα Λάγια , Ραμνούς, τάφος 8: ανασύσταση της ταφικής συμπεριφοράς μέσα από το πρίσμα της ταφονομικής και ανθρωπολογικής ανάλυσης.	203

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti

Antonio Corso, Classical, not Classicistic: Thoughts on the origins of «Classicizing Roman Sculpture», EYAIMENH 3 (2002), 11-36

Classico, non classicista: riflessioni sulle origini della cosiddetta «scultura romana classicistica» In questo articolo è affrontata la problematica delle copie di età ellenistica e soprattutto romana derivate da statue originali di età greco-classica.

Vengono distinte le varianti, che non necessariamente risalgono a un originale comune, dalle copie vere e proprie, che invece derivano dalla stessa statua.

Sono quindi esaminati casi in cui siano sopravvissuti sia l'originale sia copie da questo ottenute, la casistica delle basi da originali famosi giunte sino a noi e quella delle opere tramandate dalla tradizione antica che sono state riscoperte. Sono altresì richiamate le menzioni di maestri e capolavori di scultura e pittura da parte di scrittori di età classica. Inoltre, si riepiloga succintamente la tradizione antica della critica d'arte. È presentata in modo cursorio la storia dei tentativi di attribuire sculture superstiti agli scultori celebrati dalle fonti antiche, dal quattordicesimo secolo ai nostri giorni. È altresì preso in considerazione lo scetticismo diffuso attualmente sulla possibilità di istituire tali relazioni e sono indicati motivazioni e sostrato culturale che hanno portato diversi studiosi a tale conclusione.

Infine, è ribadita la tesi opposta, che diverse creazioni statuarie note da copie di età romana, ritenute spesso ora opere classicistiche romane, risalgono di contro a originali del quinto e quarto secolo a. C. I motivi addotti a sostegno di tale tesi sono essenzialmente tre:

1. la concordanza iconografica spesso convincente tra tipi copistici di età romana e capolavori di età classica noti da menzioni letterarie;
2. il fatto che diversi tra questi tipi sono stati rieccheggiati su rappresentazioni di piccolo formato già in età classica o nel primo ellenismo;
3. infine il fatto che le grandi arti figurative erano per lo più ritenute morte, o moribonde, durante l'età in cui la produzione copistica fu più intensa.

Antonios. Kotsonas, The rise of the polis in central Crete, EYAIMENH 3 (2002), 37-74

Η γένεση της πόλης-κράτους στην κεντρική Κρήτη. Ο 6^{ος} αι. π.Χ. θεωρείται «σκοτεινός» για την Κρήτη. Ο λαμπρός υλικός πολιτισμός της Εποχής του Σιδήρου σβήνει σχετικά απότομα στα τέλη του 7^{ου} αι. π.Χ. χωρίς εμφανή διάδοχο. Το φαινόμενο αυτό έχει παρατηρηθεί στην Κνωσό και αναφέρεται στην αγγλική βιβλιογραφία ως «archaic gap». Η παρούσα μελέτη ξεκινά από τις παρατηρήσεις για την Κνωσό και παρουσιάζει την εξάπλωση του φαινομένου, καταδεικνύοντας αιτίες που έχουν συντελέσει στη διόγκωσή του. Επισημάνσεις αναφερόμενες στο «αδιάγνωστο» της κρητικής κεραμικής του 6^{ου} αι. π.Χ. —το οποίο συντελεί καίρια στη σχετική άγνοιά μας— παρουσιάζουν αυτή την πτυχή του ζητήματος, προσπαθώντας παράλληλα να την εντάξουν στο γενικότερο πλαίσιο της ελληνικής κεραμικής παραγωγής. Ακολουθεί η ανίχνευση ενός αρχαιολογικού ορίζοντα του τέλους του 7^{ου} αι. π.Χ. σε μια σειρά θέσεων στην κεντρική Κρήτη —την καλύτερα μελετημένη περιοχή του νησιού— ανάλογα με τη λειτουργία τους: νεκροταφεία, ιερά, οικισμοί. Παρατηρείται γενική εγκατάλειψη θέσεων της Εποχής του Σιδήρου και μεταφορά των λειτουργιών τους σε νέες, ένα φαινόμενο με προφανείς κοινωνικές αναφορές. Στοιχεία από την υπόλοιπη Κρήτη επιβεβαιώνουν την εικόνα αυτή. Παράλληλα, αυξάνεται ραγδαία η παραγωγή επιγραφών, ορισμένες από τις οποίες αποκαλύπτουν την αγωνία της κοινότητας να προστατευθεί από περιπτώσεις κατάχρησης εξουσίας. Τα επιγραφικά αυτά δεδομένα και η

ερμηνεία των ανασκαφικών πορισμάτων με βάση παράλληλες ζυμώσεις στην κυρίως Ελλάδα συντελούν στην αναγνώριση του φαινομένου της δημιουργίας της πόλης-κράτους, ενός από τους σημαντικότερους θεσμούς της αρχαίας ελληνικής κοινωνίας. Απότοκο του πολιτικοκοινωνικού αυτού μετασχηματισμού αποτελεί ένα κύμα επεκτατισμού και εχθροπραξιών που κατέληξε στην καταστροφή ή παρακμή σημαντικών πόλεων, όπως ο Πρινιάς και η Κνωσός, και στην ενδυνάμωση άλλων, όπως η Λύκτος και η Γόρτυνα. Συνεπώς, προτείνεται η χρονολόγηση της γένεσης του θεσμού της πόλης-κράτους στην κεντρική Κρήτη στα τέλη του 7^{ου} αι. π.Χ., ενός θεσμού που βαθμιαία εξαπλώθηκε σε όλο το νησί και επέφερε σημαντικό αντίκτυπο στην πολιτική του γεωγραφία, αλλά και στις κοινωνικοπολιτικές και χωροταξικές δομές των επιμέρους κοινοτήτων του.

Μαρία Σταυροπούλου-Γάτση, Γεωργία Ζ. Αλεξοπούλου, ΑΝΑΚΤΟΡΙΟ-ΑΚΤΙΟ ΑΚΑΡΝΑΝΙΑΣ. Συμβολή στη μελέτη της οχύρωσης της πόλης του Ανακτορίου και στην τοπογραφία της ευρύτερης περιοχής, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 3 (2002), 75-94

Anaktorion-Aktion in Akarnania. Anaktorion was one of the most important colonies of Corinth in the Ambrakian gulf. The ruins of the city are visible in the region of Ag. Petros on the hill Kastri and have been described in E. Oberhummer, W.M. Leake, L. Heuzag, G. Neak and N.G.L. Hammond. Based on the description of the early travelers and on the plan of W.M. Leake, a survey was conducted in order to locate the ancient remains already known and also to uncover new evidence for the topography of the city. In 1995 vegetation was cleared from some parts of the older and more recent fortifications and small trenches were dug in the area occupied by the sanctuaries, roads and cemeteries of the city. The data was marked on an 1:50000 map together with a number of observations. Aktion is included in this topographical analysis, as it served as the port of Anaktorion.

David Jordan, Κατάδεσμος από τον Κεραμικό Αθηνών, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 3 (2002), 95-98

A lead curse tablet from the Athenian Kerameikos. An edition, from autopsy, of an opisthographic lead curse tablet of the fourth century B.C. from the Athenian Kerameikos. The first edition, which has appeared twice, *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica* 4 (2000) 91-99 and *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 114 (1999 [2001]) 92-96, admits of improvement. The text consists of a list of men's names plus the word γυναικα.

Παύλος Χρυσοστόμου, Συμβολές στην ιστορία της ιατρικής στην αρχαία Μακεδονία, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 3 (2002), 99-116

Contributions to the history of medicine in ancient Macedonia. The publication of two previously unpublished funerary monuments to physicians, one from Hellenistic Pella, and one from Early Christian Pella, provides an occasion for a study of the history of medicine in ancient Macedonia, the worship of the gods of medicine in the city of Pella and the health problems of its citizens. The first monument is an inscribed marble base from the 3rd quarter of the 4th century B.C., which supported a marble stele commemorating a doctor from Thasos, who worked in Pella as public physician and who died abroad (Fig. 1-2). The second monument is a marble funerary stone to a physician named Alexander, from the 1st half of the 5th century A.D. (Fig. 3).

By the 5th century B.C. the kings of Macedonia were already displaying a considerable interest in medicine, accentuating their care for the army and for their subjects. The development of medical science was chiefly due to the presence at the royal court, as visitors or as permanent

residents, of such illustrious physicians as Hippocrates and his son Thessalus, Nicomachus the father of Aristotle, Critobulus of Cos, Philippus of Acarnan, Menecrates of Syracuse, Hippocrates, the son of Draco, and Polydorus of Teios. Historical sources tell us that Critobulus, Cridodemus and Draco of Cos served in the medical corps in the army of Alexander the Great's, as did Philippus of Acarnania, who was Alexander personal physician, and Alexippus, Pausanias and Glaucus (or Glaucias), respectively the personal physicians of Peucestas, Craterus and Hephaestion. Alexander himself had been initiated into the art of medicine by his tutor Aristotle, and had sufficient medical knowledge to attend to the medical and pharmaceutical care of his friends and his men. From archaeological evidence we know of another physician, who died at Pydna in early Hellenistic period and who, judging from his instruments, must have been a surgeon (Fig. 4–6). In contrast to the Hellenistic kingdoms of the East, however, nothing is known of any other physicians from the time of Cassander to the late Hellenistic period.

In the imperial age the medical profession had made great progress, with the invention of new instruments and through specialisation in the diseases of the various organs of the body. The position of public physician, or chief medical officer, that had been instituted in the Roman world, is also attested in Macedonia in the person of Aurelius Isidorus, scion of a prominent Thessalonican family. The «medici» in the Macedonian colonies also appear to have had some connections in Macedonia were self-employed professional physicians (Sextus Iulius Chariton of Amphipolis, Titus Servius and his wife Servia of Thessalonica, Pubicius Lalus and Publicius Hermias of Beroea, Aelius Nicolaus of Edessa, Aptus of Dion, Theodorus of Kato Kleines Florinas and C. Iulius Nicetas of Lyke, as well as Athryilatus of Thasos and Theodorus of Macedonia, known from literary sources). In addition to Alexander of Pella, Early Christian inscriptions also mention the physicians Paul of Philippi, Damian of Thessalonica and Anthemius of Edessa.

In Macedonia, as elsewhere, medicine progressed *in tandem* with the cult of Asclepius, which is attested in many cities (Beroea, Mieza, Dion, Thessalonica, Moryllus, Kalindoia, Antigoneia, Cassandreia, Amphipolis, Philippi, etc.). The priests of Asclepius were illustrious men from the cities of Macedonia, and his priesthood was an office of great social prestige and of particular importance in the organisation of the Macedonian kingdom. Archaeological excavations in the south-west sector of Pella have brought to light a large sanctuary of Asclepius, whose temple and altar were also used for the worship of Apollo, Heracles and the local healing divinity Darro, to whom the prayers for the sick were addressed. The worship of these gods, which continued in Roman Pella too, was an essential feature in the lives of the inhabitants of the city, whose health was affected by problems associated with bad water and malaria.

Eva Apostolou, Rhodes hellénistique. Les trésors et la circulation monétaire, *EYΛIMENH* 3 (2002), 117-182

Ελληνιστική Ρόδος. Οι θησαυροί και η νομισματική κυκλοφορία. Η εξέταση των «θησαυρών» που περιέχουν ροδιακά νομίσματα, εκδόσεις του ενιαίου ροδιακού κράτους, από ιδρύσεώς του, το 408 π.Χ., μέχρι τις αρχές του 1ου αι. π.Χ., οδηγεί στα ακόλουθα συμπεράσματα:

1. Η κυκλοφορία του ροδιακού νομίσματος σ' όλη την προαναφερόμενη περίοδο αποδεικνύεται αρκετά περιορισμένη εκτός των ορίων του ροδιακού κράτους.

2. Ο συστηματικός έλεγχος της κυκλοφορίας του νομίσματος εντός της ροδιακής επικράτειας επιτυγχάνεται με την περιοδική κατάργηση και την απόσυρση της προγενέστερης εγχώριας νομισματικής παραγωγής (ή μέρους της) και παράλληλα με την αντικατάστασή της από νέες και εξελιγμένες ως προς τους νομισματικούς τύπους εκδόσεις.

3. Ο «κλειστός» χαρακτήρας της ροδιακής οικονομίας στηρίζει την εμπορική και πολιτική δραστηριότητα των Ροδίων, και αποτελεί σημαντικό παράγοντα της ευημερίας τους κατά την υπό εξέταση περίοδο.

Robert C. Knapp, Greek Mercenaries, Coinage and Ideology, EYΛIMENH 3 (2002), 183-196

Έλληνες μισθοφόροι, νόμισμα και ιδεολογία. Οι σκοτεινοί αιώνες υπήρξαν για τον ελληνικό πολιτισμό η αφετηρία των σημαντικότερων αλλαγών που διακρίνονται αργότερα κατά την αρχαϊκή εποχή. Στην παρούσα εργασία υπογραμμίζεται η διαφορά στον τρόπο ζωής στην Ελλάδα των σκοτεινών αιώνων και στους πιο εξελιγμένους πολιτισμούς της Εγγύς Ανατολής και της Αιγύπτου, προκειμένου να γίνει αντιληπτό πόσο αποσταθεροποιητικοί πρέπει να υπήρξαν αυτοί οι πολιτισμοί στη ζωή των Ελλήνων που έρχονταν σε επαφή μαζί τους. Ενώ οι περισσότεροι μελετητές επικεντρώνονται στους εμπόρους ως την κύρια ομάδα επαφής, εδώ δίνεται έμφαση στους Έλληνες μισθοφόρους, οι οποίοι πολέμησαν στην Αίγυπτο και σε ολόκληρη την Εγγύς Ανατολή στα τέλη των σκοτεινών αιώνων και κατά την αρχαϊκή περίοδο. Η μισθοφορική υπηρεσία, όχι μόνο εξέθεσε τους Έλληνες σε διαφορετικούς υλικούς πολιτισμούς, αλλά επίσης συνέβαλλε στην διαμόρφωση της ιδέας περί Ελληνικής «εθνικότητας». Επιπλέον, αυτές οι επαφές οδήγησαν στην συνειδητοποίηση ότι οι κληρονομικές κοινωνικές δομές που βασιζόνταν στη γενιά, «πίσω στην πατρίδα», θα μπορούσαν να αλλάξουν προς όφελος εκείνων που είχαν αποκομίσει πλούτο και αυτοπεποίθηση στο εξωτερικό. Η παρούσα μελέτη ασχολείται ειδικότερα με τον πραγματικό και συμβολικό ρόλο του νομίσματος σε αυτή την πολιτισμική αφύπνιση. Όποια και αν είναι τα πραγματικά πλεονεκτήματα του νομίσματος και οποιαδήποτε η πρακτική σχέση της εισαγωγής του με τα προϋπάρχοντα νομισματικά συστήματα της Δ. Ασίας, η συμβολική του δύναμη ήταν να ενδυναμώσει τον πυρήνα του κινητού πλούτου και να αμβλύνει την εξουσία του ακίνητου, βασισμένου στη γη, πλούτου. Ήταν επίσης ένα δυναμικό σύμβολο της σχετικότητας της δύναμης και ουσιαστικά η πραγματική ρίζα της δύναμης, άσχετα με τους μύθους που υπήρχαν για να νομιμοποιούν την συνέχιση της εξουσίας από μια ελίτ. Ως νόμισμα, το χρήμα ήταν πλέον πιο ορατό και ευκολότερο να αποκτηθεί από πριν, και ως τέτοιο μπορούσε να χρησιμοποιηθεί με μεγαλύτερη ευχέρεια για την αποσταθεροποίηση των υπαρχόντων διανοητικών και εξουσιαστικών δομών μιας ελίτ. Εν κατακλείδι, η εισαγωγή του νομίσματος αποτελεί αφενός τμήμα της πολιτισμικής μεταβολής που επηρεάστηκε από την επαφή των Ελλήνων μισθοφόρων με τους πολιτισμούς της Εγγύς Ανατολής και της Αιγύπτου και αφετέρου έμβλημα των πολιτισμικών συνεπειών της ελληνικής εμπειρίας που αποκτήθηκε σε εκείνες τις περιοχές.

Nahum Cohen, A Poll-tax Receipt, EYΛIMENH 3 (2002), 197-200

Απόδειξη καταβολής φόρου (λαογραφίας). Πάπυρος διατηρημένος σε καλή κατάσταση. Πρόκειται για μία απόδειξη καταβολής κεφαλικού φόρου, της λαογραφίας, από έναν φορολογούμενο του οποίου το όνομα έχει χαθεί. Διασώζονται μόνο τα ονόματα των γονέων του, Ονήσιμος και Ηρ(), και του παππού του, Ωρίων. Το πληρωθέν ποσόν είναι 20 δραχμές και 10 χαλκοί. Το έγγραφο χρονολογείται στις 24 Ιουλίου ενός εκ των ετών 177, 178 ή 179 μ.Χ. και προέρχεται από την πρωτεύουσα του Αρσινόϊτου νομού.

David Jordan, Άλλο ένα παράδειγμα του Ψαλμού 90.1, EYΛIMENH 3 (2002), 201

Another example of LXX Ps. 90.1. In a writing exercise found on a fragmentary wooden tablet, published at BIFAO 101 (2001) 160–2 (V or VI A.D.), there are several lines beginning ὁ κατο[or ὁ κατοί[. Restore, in whole or in part, LXX Ps. 90.1, 'Ο κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ Ὑψίστου ἐν σκέπῃ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀύλισθήσεται.

Άννα Λάγια, Ραμνούς, τάφος 8: ανασύσταση της ταφικής συμπεριφοράς μέσα από το πρίσμα της ταφονομικής και ανθρωπολογικής ανάλυσης, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 3 (2002), 203-222

Ramnous, the stone-cist burial Nr 8: mortuary behavior in the light of the taphonomic and anthropological analysis. The significance of applying taphonomic considerations during the excavation and analysis of a burial as a crucial factor in understanding its function is discussed and it is argued that it requires the participation of an expert in human morphology. The basic taphonomic processes that are important for understanding mortuary behavior are presented and are then applied to the analysis of a multiple burial of the late antiquity from the Necropolis of Ramnous. The stone-cist burial Nr 8 from Ramnous comprised the inhumations of six individuals, three adults and three sub-adults. The position of the skeletal remains in the grave raised questions concerning the manner of burial and the sequence of inhumations. Detailed analysis of the mortuary context, the position of the skeletal remains during excavation, the state of preservation of the bones and bone modifications as a result of taphonomic processes, in combination with the biological profile of the skeletons, suggests that the six individuals were buried in three separate burial episodes. The latest burial was that of an adolescent female that was found *in situ* at the uppermost level of the grave. This had been preceded by the (almost?) synchronous burial of three adults that were laid successively at a deeper level. The earliest inhumations were those of two children, the remains of which were found at the lowest level of the grave in a relatively poor state of preservation. It is argued that the architecture of the grave and the surrounding rocks created different microenvironments within the grave and played a crucial role in the manner of burial and the post depositional position of the skeletal remains. The excavation techniques that were used ensured that bone preservation was a result of events that took place prior to the excavation. The skeleton of the adolescent had the best state of preservation. Among the adults no differences in preservation in relation to sex, age and stratigraphy were observed. Modification of bone surfaces supports the view that the individuals that were the last to bury from each burial episode, were exposed to weathering prior to soil being sieved-in.

CLASSICAL, NOT CLASSICISTIC: THOUGHTS ON THE ORIGINS OF «CLASSICIZING ROMAN SCULPTURE».¹

For art historians, when a number of representations of a deity, hero or famous ancient person are so similar to each other that they might be thought of as variations on a theme, these representations are called examples of a *type*. Of any given iconographical type, there can exist faithful reproductions, called *copies*, and less faithful reproductions, called *variations*.² When the variations are loose, it is quite possible that any given example was conceived independently and that the variant image was, in fact, re-invented casually. The similarities between such variation can often be explained by the fact that standard iconographies were often employed for various subjects in the popular imagination or that the variation in question was inspired or influenced by a literary description. In these cases, it becomes difficult to be certain when representations echo an important work of art, an *original*, which predates the variant.

A good example of the problematic relationship that can exist between variants and originals is the case of the Zeus Ithomatas. Sometime during the second quarter of the fifth century BC, a bronze statue of Zeus was made by the Argive sculptor Hageladas for the Messenians living in Naupactus. On return to their homeland, the Messenians placed this statue on the sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Ithome.

Pausanias (4.33.2) reports the existence of the image and the same statue is represented on Messenian coins of the fourth and third centuries BC. From the coins, it is known that Zeus was shown naked, striking to right. In his right hand he held the thunderbolt while an eagle perched on his left wrist³ (fig. 1).

This type is further seen in the famous bronze Zeus (Athens, NAM 15161) recovered from the sea near Cape Artemisium and dated to the second quarter of the fifth century BC⁴. This statue, however, cannot be Hageladas' Zeus, since that image still stood in the second century AD, to be seen by Pausanias while the Artemisium Zeus probably sank sometime in the second century BC, most likely in a ship travelling from

¹ Early versions of this article have been given as lectures in Athens (Psaropoulou Foundation, September 2000) as well as in Budapest (Collegium Budapest–Institute for Advanced Study, November 2000).

² On the distinction among the different degrees of reproductions of a type, see C. Gasparri, «Copie e copisti», *EAA*, Suppl. 2.2 (1994) 267–280.

³ See P.G. Themelis, *Herooes kai heroa sti Messini*, Athina (2000) 47, fig. 38. On Hageladas, see P. Moreno, «Hageladas», D. Vollkommer–Glökler (ed.), *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 1, München (2001) 275–280: this scholar thinks the ancient writers who mention Hageladas refer in fact to two different sculptors; on the contrary, I think that they refer to the same artist, see A. Corso, «Competitions between Myron, Pheidias and Polykleitos», *NumAntCl* 24 (1995) 173–188.

⁴ See Ch. Piteros, «O Dias tou Artemisiou kai o Poseidonas tou Istmou», D. Pandermalis (ed.), *Agalma. Meletes gia tin archaia plastiki pros timin tou Giorgiou Despini*, Thessaloniki (2001) 99–121.

the Greek mainland to Pergamum.⁵ There are also some important physical differences between the image represented on Messenian coins and the Artemisium Zeus. On the coins, Zeus' right arm is sharply bent while the right arm of the Artemisium Zeus is almost fully extended. It is also significant that there are no traces of the eagle on the Artemisium bronze's left arm. Most important, however, is the fact that the same type is known through several other examples, most notably the bronze Zeus from Dodona (Berlin, Altes Museum 10561), probably made in Corinth around 470 BC⁶ and the Zeus from Ugento in south-eastern Italy, made ca 530–520.⁷ Since the Zeus from Ugento is at least 50 years earlier than Hageladas' Zeus, it is virtually certain that Hageladas did not invent the type that he adopted, but rather relied on an older iconographic tradition. It is quite logical to conclude, then, that in this case the similarity of these three images is best explained by the notion that the Greek sculptors responsible for them were working within a traditional iconography of Zeus rather than that they somehow copied a sixth century original.

There are other cases, however, when sculptures are so similar to each other that it is virtually certain they are copies of one original statue. The many copies of the Doryphorus type by Polykleitos, for example, are so similar—even at the most detailed level—that there is no question that they derive from the same original bronze⁸ (fig. 2). The original, of course, was the famous Doryphorus of Polykleitos, made in Argos sometime around 450 BC and described by ancient writers Pliny, Quintilian and Lucian.⁹ In cases as the Doryphorus, when copies are so exact, the use of casts is guaranteed, and plaster casts of several famous bronze statues have indeed been found at Baiae, near the Greek colony of Cuma in Italy. These casts were owned by a copyist workshop established on the Tyrrhenian coast in the late first century A.D. The casts had been taken from several bronze masterpieces of the Greek world, such as Critius and Nesiotes' Tyrant-slayers, the Amazons of Ephesus, the Velletri Athena, the Borghese Aphrodite, the Westmacott Ephebe, Cephisodotus' Eirene with Plutus, the Belvedere Apollo, the Narcissus and the Corinth Persephone, among others. All of the types noted above are known through several copies and it now seems certain that the casts were originally intended for the copyist market of Roman Italy.

Now, in the case of the copies made by the Tyrrhenian workshop, there were several partial casts of different body parts of the copied statues. The original creations were protected with pitch or with wax.¹⁰ There did exist many other cases, however, in

⁵ On the Artemisium Cape's shipwreck, see A.J. Parker, *Ancient Shipwrecks of the Mediterranean and the Roman Provinces*, Oxford (1992) 60, no. 57.

⁶ See C. Rolley, *La sculpture grecque*, Paris 1 (1994) 333–336, with fig. 341.

⁷ See Rolley (nt. 6) 301–304, figs. 307–308.

⁸ On the copies of the Doryphorus by Polykleitos, see D. Kreikenbom, *Bildwerke nach Polyklet*, Berlin (1990) 59–94 and 163–180; Themelis (nt. 3) 59–87.

⁹ Polykleitos' Doryphorus is known especially through the following sources: Pliny 34.55; Quintilian 5.12.21; Lucian, *De saltatione* 75; other ancient *testimonia* on this statue can be found in J. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen*, Leipzig (1868) 170–172, nos. 953–961; see moreover A. Stewart, «Nuggets: Mining the Texts again», *AJA* 102 (1998) 273–278. On the reconstruction of the original bronze statue by Polykleitos from which the surviving copies depend, see B. Wesenberg, «Für eine situative Deutung des Polykletischen Doryphoros», *JdI* 112 (1997) 59–75.

¹⁰ See C. Landwehr, *Die antiken Gypsabgüsse aus Baiae. Griechische Bronzestatuen in Abgüssen Römischer Zeit*, Berlin (1985); C. Gasparri, «L' officina dei calchi di Baia», *RM* 102 (1995) 173–187.

which it was forbidden to take casts from the originals. In these instances, copies were made at a distance from the originals. This was often the case when the originals were marble rather than bronze. Naturally, copies made in this fashion were less accurate. While there did exist certain cases in which it was possible to take the exact measures from the statues copied—a fact that explains why different copies from the same originals often share the basic dimensions of single elements even when the copies had been taken at a distance from the originals—there were many cases in which it was impossible to touch the original statues or even get near them. In these cases, the copies are, of course, even less faithful, even with regard to the size and dimensions of anatomical units. The Cnidian Aphrodite offers a good example of a statue which could be seen only from a certain distance. Visitors could view the goddess from just two viewpoints: frontally, upon entering the temple from the front door, and then, after having gone outside the temple and entered again through a rear door, behind, contemplating her back, according to Lucian, *Amores* 13–17.

A massive copyist industry based on Classical Greek originals finds its roots in the early second century BC and corresponds, apparently, to the monumental policy of Pergamum.¹¹ This industry, run often by Attic workshops, began to serve Roman and Italian markets from ca. 80 BC and flourished until ca. 230 A.D., a period during which time the visual arts are often thought to be dead or dying. The industry was particularly active during the Hadrianic–Antonine period. Copies become less frequent in the third century A.D., but some are known in the period of Diocletian and Constantine.¹² With the establishment of the *civitas Christiana*, the copying of Classical images became sporadic while the reproduction of Christian images, as icons, blossomed. The Hodegetria Virgin, for example, is represented as a standard type throughout the Byzantine empire while the original icon stood at Constantinople.¹³

In addition to the information offered by the Baiae casts, it is also worth remembering that there are several cases in which both original and the copies are preserved. The most famous case is that of the Erechtheum Corai. Copies of these famous fifth century images were created in the Roman times, especially during the ages of Augustus and Hadrian¹⁴ (fig. 3). Another example is that of the so-called Olympias, a statue of a seated Aphrodite. A fragment of the original marble statue has been discovered and several Roman copies, derived from this original, survive. This piece has been restored on a base located near the Propylaea on the Athenian Acropolis which records a dedication of a statue of Aphrodite and the signature of the famous sculptor Calamis.¹⁵ A final well-known example is provided by the Nemesis of Rhamnus by Agoracritus. Many fragments of this image have been found and several Roman copies of

¹¹ See J.–P. Niemeier, *Kopien und Nachahmungen im Hellenismus*, Bonn (1985).

¹² On copyist production in the Roman period, see Gasparri (nt. 2), with previous bibliography.

¹³ On Byzantine icons, the bibliography is, of course, very large. I cite only: R. Cormach, *Writing in Gold. Byzantine Society and its Icons*, London (1985).

¹⁴ See E.E. Schmidt, «Die Kopien der Erechtheionkoren», *Antike Plastik* 13 (1973).

¹⁵ See A. Delivorrias, «Aphrodite», *LIMC* 2 (1984) 90–91, nos. 819–841. On the Aphrodite dedicated by Callias near the Propylaea on the Acropolis of Athens, see Pausanias 1.23.2 and *IG* i³, 876; Delivorrias (above in this nt.) 23, no. 146.

this masterpiece survive.¹⁶ The famous Hermes of Olympia has been copied in a wall-painting in the Casa del Naviglio at Pompeii.¹⁷

In addition to the copyists, the ancient literary tradition also preserves names and, sometime, descriptions of the great masterpieces of the most important fifth and fourth century artists. For the most part, these works have long since vanished but several statue bases survive. The bronze statue of the athlete Cyniscus at Olympia, made by Polycleitos, for example, is lost but it is mentioned by Pausanias and its base survives.¹⁸

There are works of art by famous sculptors celebrated in the ancient literary tradition which survive: the Nike by Paeonius at Olympia is a famous example¹⁹ (fig. 4).

It is particularly important to note that several masterpieces of the Classical period are already mentioned by their near contemporary, writers of the fifth and fourth centuries. Demosthenes, for example, mentions Phidias' colossal bronze Athena.²⁰ Isocrates (in two passages),²¹ Demosthenes²² and Plato²³ already praise Phidias' Athena Parthenos, a statue mentioned even by Thucydides.²⁴ Phidias was regarded as an influential man from a political point of view by Aristophanes²⁵ and Plato praises Phidias in two passages.²⁶ Aristotle does the same.²⁷ Polycleitos is praised equally by Plato,²⁸ Xenophon,²⁹ in the *dissoi logoi*³⁰ and by Aristotle.³¹ Among the painters, Polygnotus is praised by Plato twice³² and by Aristotle three times.³³ Micon's Amazonomachy in the

¹⁶ See G. I. Despinis, *Simboli sti meleti tou ergou tou Agorakritou*, Athina (1971) 1–108 and 162–177.

¹⁷ Praxiteles' Hermes carrying Dionysus had been seen at Olympia by Pausanias 5.17.3. On the painted copy of this masterpiece, see E.M. Moormann, *La pittura parietale romana come fonte di conoscenza per la scultura antica*, Assen (1988) 181, no. 207/2. The case of classical reliefs which have survived and are also known through Roman copies is not considered here. See, e.g., the Large Relief of Eleusis, dated around 440–430 BC and known also through Roman copies: L. Beschi, «Demeter», *LIMC* 4 (1988) 875, no. 375.

¹⁸ This statue is known thanks to Pausanias 6.4.11, who specifies that the sculptor was Polycleitos. Its inscribed base survives (see W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia*, Berlin (1896) 255–258, no. 149). The identification of Polycleitus' Cyniscus as the original statue of the Westmacott Ephebe is controversial (see E. Angelicoussis, *The Holkham Collection of Classical Sculptures*, Mainz am Rhein (2001) 79–80, no. 1), but I believe it is the right one.

¹⁹ See Pausanias 5.26.1; Dittenberger and Purgold (nt. 18) 377–384, no. 259; and P. Schultz, «The Akroteria of the Temple of Athena Nike», *Hesperia* 70 (2001) 34–36, figs. 22–23.

²⁰ See Demosthenes, *De falsa legatione* 272.

²¹ See Isocrates, *Contra Callimachum* 57 and *De permutatione* 2.

²² See Demosthenes, *Contra Timocratem* 121.

²³ See Plato, *Hippias major* 290 a–b.

²⁴ See Thucydides 2.13.5.

²⁵ See Aristophanes, *Pax* 605.

²⁶ See Plato, *Protagoras* 311b–c; and *Meno* 91d.

²⁷ See Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea* 1141a.

²⁸ See Plato, *Protagoras* 311 b–c and 328c–d.

²⁹ See Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.4.2.

³⁰ See *Dissoi logoi* 6.8 (see E. Ghisellini, «Note in margine a due fonti su Policleto», *Xenia* 20 (1990) 33–40).

³¹ See Aristotle, *Metaphysica* 1013 b–1014 a; and *Ethica Nicomachea* 1141a.

³² See Plato, *Ion* 532 e and *Gorgias* 448 b.

³³ See Aristotle, *Politica* 1340a; *Poetica* 1448a and 1450a.

Stoa Poikile is praised by Aristophanes,³⁴ while Micon's Battle of Marathon is mentioned by Lycurgus.³⁵ Pausanias is mentioned by Aristophanes three times,³⁶ by Aristotle twice.³⁷ Agatharchus is evoked by Andocides³⁸ and Demosthenes.³⁹ Aristophanes is mentioned by Plato,⁴⁰ Dionysius of Colophon by Aristotle,⁴¹ Zeuxis is praised by Plato twice,⁴² by Xenophon three times,⁴³ by Isocrates once⁴⁴ and again by Aristotle.⁴⁵ Parrhasius was loved by Xenophon.⁴⁶ Concerning Late Classical masters, Praxiteles' Cnidian Aphrodite is praised in two epigrams attributed to Plato⁴⁷ and a pair of statues by Leochares are praised in a letter attributed to Plato.⁴⁸

Clearly, the impact of the greatest works of the Classical masters was already felt in the Classical period and it is quite true to say that Aristophanes, Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle saw these works as the particular expressions of an individual master's skill and talent. Since the great artistic personalities of the Classical Age were recognised as such sometime already during their lifetimes, the phenomenon of the particular artistic personality can hardly be thought of as the by-product of an art historical myth-making. Indeed, during the late fourth and the early third centuries BC, the first treatises focused specifically on individual Classical painters and sculptors appeared. Duris of Samos wrote two such treatises in ca. 300 BC. While only few fragments survive, his famous text on the early career of Lysippus reveals that the visual arts were already viewed through the cult of personality.⁴⁹

This individualised conception of the artist is implicit in many early Hellenistic descriptions of art works composed in epigram by early third century Greek poets as Posidippus,⁵⁰ Leonidas,⁵¹ Theocritus⁵² and Herodas.⁵³ This view can also be seen in

³⁴ See Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 678–679.

³⁵ See Lycurgus, in Harpocration, *s.v. Micon*.

³⁶ See Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 854; *Thesmophoriazousae* 948–952; and *Plutus* 602.

³⁷ See Aristotle, *Politica* 1340a; and *Poetica* 1148a.

³⁸ See Andocides, *Contra Alcibiadem* 17.

³⁹ See Demosthenes, *Contra Midiam* 147.

⁴⁰ See Plato, *Gorgias* 448b.

⁴¹ See Aristotle, *Poetica* 1448a.

⁴² See Plato, *Protagoras* 318b; and *Gorgias* 453c.

⁴³ See Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 10.1; *Symposium* 4.63; *Memorabilia* 1.4.3.

⁴⁴ See Isocrates, *Antidosis* 2.

⁴⁵ See Aristotle, *Poetica* 1450a and 1461b.

⁴⁶ See Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 3.10.

⁴⁷ See Plato, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.160–161; and my comments on these two epigrams in A. Corso, «Small Nuggets about late-classical Sculpture», *NumAntCl* 29 (2000) 150–151.

⁴⁸ See Plato, *Epistulae* 13.361a. I have not included in this catalogue of mentions of Classical masters by Classical authors the references of writers who flourished before the Hellenistic period to masters of the Archaic period, such as Daedalus (see Overbeck (nt. 9) 12, nos. 76 and 86; 15, nos. 110 and 118–121; 16, no. 122; 17, no. 139; and 35, no. 225), Epeius (see Overbeck 35, nos. 224–225), Glaucus (see Overbeck 47, no. 263), Rhoecus (see Overbeck 48, no. 273), Theodorus (see Overbeck 35, no. 225; and 50, nos. 284–285) and especially Bupalus and Athenis (see Hipponax, *frag.* 1–6; 17–20; 70; 77; 86; 98; 121; and 140 Degani).

⁴⁹ Duris, *De toreutice*, *frag.* 32, *FGrHist* 2a Jacoby, no. 76. On Duris, see F.L. Gattinoni, *Duride di Samo*, Roma (1997), especially 40, nt. 5; and 47, nt. 37, on his contribution to ancient art criticism.

⁵⁰ See Posidippus 11–14; 17; and 20 Page (not included in the Anthology); moreover, *Anthologia Graeca* 16.119 and 275; 10.7–38 and 11.1–39 Bastianini–Gallazzi–Austin.

several treatises on the visual arts as those by Xenocrates (early third century),⁵⁴ Antigonus (third quarter of the third century),⁵⁵ Polemon of Ilium (early second century BC),⁵⁶ Alcetas (same period)⁵⁷ and Apollodorus of Athens (middle to third quarter of the second century BC).⁵⁸

Finally, the most important works of art of Classical masters are often praised by late-republican writers such as Cicero⁵⁹ and Varro⁶⁰ and especially by writers of the Roman imperial period, as Pliny,⁶¹ Quintilian,⁶² Lucian,⁶³ Pausanias⁶⁴ and Athenaeus.⁶⁵ Long descriptions of paintings are given by the two Philostrati, in the early third century A.D. and in the age of Diocletian,⁶⁶ respectively. Callistratus, writing perhaps in the early third century A.D. also describes sculpture of the great masters.⁶⁷

In an attempt to identify the famous masterpieces of master sculptors, many scholars have tried to connect these texts with sculptural types known from Roman copies. This trend began early in the fourteenth century and finds its roots in the contemporary habit to attribute works of art to well known artists as well as in the wish to restore the outline of the ancient visual arts given by Pliny the Elder.⁶⁸ Petrarch, for

⁵¹ See Leonidas, *Anthologia Graeca* 6.211; 7.163; 9.179; 320; 719; 744; 16.171; 182; 190; 206; 236; 261; 306; and 318. On Leonidas, see J. Clack, *Leonidas of Tarentum*, Wauconda (1999) 77–186.

⁵² See Theocritus, *Idylli* 1.27–58; 5.104–105; 15.119–135; 28.1–25; *Anthologia Graeca* 6. 177; 336–340; 7.664; 9.338; 433; 435–437; 598–600. On Theocritus, see K.–H. Stanzel, *Liebende Hirten; Theokrits Bukolik und die Alexandrinische Poesie*, Stuttgart (1995).

⁵³ See Herodas 4. 20–78. On Herodas, see L. Di Gregorio, *Eronda, Mimiambi*, Milan (1997) ix–xxvii; on the fourth mimiambus, 241–309.

⁵⁴ On Xenocrates, see B. Schweitzer, *Xenokrates von Athen*, Halle (1932) 1–19 and 47–52.

⁵⁵ On Antigonus, see T. Dorandi, *Antigone de Caryste, fragments*, Paris (1999) xi–cxxiii; on his treatises *de toreutice* and *de pictura*, 35–37 and 53–55.

⁵⁶ On Polemon, see L. Preller, *Polemonis periegetae fragmenta*, Leipzig (1838) 3–30 and 155–199.

⁵⁷ On Alcetas, see A. Corso, *Prassitele* 2, Rome (1990) 49 and 177, nt. 1360.

⁵⁸ On Apollodorus, see F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, Berlin (1902) 1–59.

⁵⁹ On Cicero as a writer on Classical Greek works of art, see A. Desmoulier, *Cicéron et son goût*, Bruxelles (1976) 33–75; 86–102; 247–265; 285–316; 445–595.

⁶⁰ On Varro and his approach to visual arts, see G. Becatti, *Arte e gusto negli scrittori latini*, Florence (1951) 63–72 and 299–300, sources nos. 1–8.

⁶¹ On Pliny and his books on visual arts, see J. Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society. The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, London (1991) 80–211 and 223–224.

⁶² On Quintilian as a source on Greek visual arts, see A. Corso, *Prassitele* 1, Rome (1988) 115–116 and 217–218, nts. 709 and 713–716.

⁶³ On Lucian and his criticism on visual arts, see my book (nt. 62) 124–140 and 219–223, nts. 765; 767; 778; 784; 797–798; 802; 805; 810; 813–814; 818–820; 824; 827; 829–843; 858–860; and 867.

⁶⁴ On Pausanias, see W.E. Hutton, *The topographical Methods of Pausanias*, Ann Arbor (2000).

⁶⁵ On Athenaeus, see D. Braund and J. Wilkins (edd.), *Athenaeus and his World*, Exeter (2000).

⁶⁶ On the *Imagines* by Philostratus major, see F. Graziani, *Les images ou tableaux de platte/peinture / Philostrate*, Paris (1995). On the *Imagines* by Philostratus minor, see R. Popowski, «Filostrat», *Vox patrum* 11–12. 20–23 (1991–1992) 325–344.

⁶⁷ On Callistratus, see A. Corso, «Attitudes to the visual Arts of classical Greece in late Antiquity», *Eulimene* 2 (2001) 13–51.

⁶⁸ On this trend during the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see A. Corso, «Il collezionismo di scultura nell'antichità», G. Fusconi (ed.), *I Giustiniani e l'antico*, Rome (2001) 101–129, in particular 122–123 and 128–129, nt. 165.

example, early on attributed the two colossal statues of Dioscuri of Montecavallo (the medieval name of the Quirinale Hill at Rome) to Phidias and Praxiteles —no doubt because of their inscribed labels, in which Phidias appears as the master of one Dioscurus and Praxiteles of the other⁶⁹— then regarded as the two great sculptors of the Classical period. B. Rambaldi from Imola attributes a statue of Aphrodite, probably of the Capitoline type, to Praxiteles.⁷⁰ At Siena, an ancient female statue, probably a naked Aphrodite, was attributed to Lysippus in the first half of the fourteenth century, on the basis of the name of this sculptor inscribed on its base.⁷¹ The S. Marco horses have been attributed to Phidias, Lysippus or Praxiteles since 1436.⁷² An erotic relief in Ghiberti's collection in the 1530s, the so-called «Polycleitan bed», was attributed to this sculptor.⁷³ A relief re-used in a church near Argus was attributed to Polycleitos by C. dei Pizziccoli of Ancona.⁷⁴ In the early sixteenth century, an easy and immediate identification of the Laocoon as the same group mentioned by Pliny as the work of Agesandrus, Polydorus and Athenodorus, suggested itself immediately after the discovery of this piece in 1506⁷⁵ (fig. 5). The Hercules with Antaeus, then in the Vatican Belvedere, now in Pitti Palace in Florence was attributed to Polycleitos by 1510,⁷⁶ and the Cupido in the collection of Isabella d'Este was given to Praxiteles by 1505, whilst the «Worshipper» at that time at Venice, now at Berlin, was given to the same sculptor in 1549 by P. Aretino.⁷⁷

This effort to reconstitute the historical dimension of the ancient world —begun by Ligorio in the sixteenth century and followed in the seventeenth century by scholars such as Gruter, dal Pozzo, Bellori, and others— revealed a new interest in relating the surviving ancient sculptures to the ancient literary accounts of statues made by renowned masters. In 1579, the Farnese Bull was also identified as the marble group carved by Apollonius and Tauriscus representing the fable of Dirce mentioned by Pliny and this piece is, in fact, now recognised as a true copy⁷⁸ (fig. 6). In 1638, the Medici Niobids were recognised by Perrier as the Niobe group mentioned by Pliny as a work of either

⁶⁹ See Petrararch, *Africa* 8. 907–909; *Ad familiares* 12.7.4. See M. Bettini, «Francesco Petrarca sulle arti figurative», S. Settis (ed.), *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana* 1, Turin (1984) 237. The inscription declaring the two Dioscuri as works respectively of Phidias and Praxiteles is *CIL* 6.2.10038. See S. Geppert, «Die monumentalen Dioskurengruppen in Rom», *Antike Plastik* 25 (1996) 133–147.

⁷⁰ See B. Rambaldi from Imola, *Commentarium* to D. Alighieri, *Commedia*, *Purgatorio* 10.32–33, *ad locum*.

⁷¹ See L. Ghiberti, *Commentari* 1.1 and R. Cittadini, «Figure femminili di Lisippo», *BdA* 100 (1997) 67–69.

⁷² See L. Borrelli Vlad and A. Guidi Toniato, «Fonti e documentazione sui Cavalli di S. Marco», G. Perocco and R. Zorzi (ed.), *I Cavalli di S. Marco*, Venice (1981) 98–99.

⁷³ See E. Zöllner, «Policretior manu—zum Polykletbild der frühen Neuzeit», H. Beck *et alii* (eds.), *Polyklet*, Mainz am Rhein (1990) 450–472.

⁷⁴ See L. Beschi, «La scoperta dell'arte greca», Settis (nt. 69) 3 (1986) 298–307.

⁷⁵ See Pliny 36.37 and S. Maffei, «La fama del Laocoonte nei testi del cinquecento», S. Settis, *Laocoonte. Fama e stile*, Roma (1999) 101, no. ii. 1.

⁷⁶ See F. Haskell and N. Penny, *Taste and the Antique. The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500–1900*, New Haven (1981) 233.

⁷⁷ See Beschi (nt. 74) 304–305. See also N. Hockländer, «Der betende Knabe», G. Zimmer and N. Hockländer (eds.), *Der betende Knabe*, Frankfurt/M (1997) 25–34.

⁷⁸ See Pliny 36.34 and C. Kunze, *Der Farnesische Stier und die Dirkegruppe des Apollonios und Tauriskos*, Berlin (1998) 25.

Praxiteles or Scopas.⁷⁹ In 1671, the Dutch antiquarian Spanheim, visiting the collection of coins of the king of France Louis Fourteenth, examined a coin struck by the Cnidians during the reign of Caracalla. The coin bore an image of a naked statue of Aphrodite shielding her pubis with her right hand and taking up her drapery deposited on a kalpis. Remembering the description of Praxiteles' Aphrodite at Cnidus made in Lucian's *Amores*, where this statue is described in a similar attitude, he exclaimed: *illinc celebrem illam Venerem Cnidian nudam, quae velum sinistra manu e vase tollit*.⁸⁰ In 1683, the Farnese Venus was recognised as the Callipygos Aphrodite mentioned by Cercidas, Archelaus and Athenaeus, of which it is often regarded as a copy.⁸¹

These efforts to compare literary descriptions with figurative evidence, as well as the rationalistic mentality of the eighteenth century (which promoted determinations of «fixed points» in knowledge of the ancient world) led to the establishment of other identifications in the 1720s.

Von Stosch, for example, suggested in 1724 that an emerald in a Dutch collection reproduced the famous statue by Praxiteles of a young Apollo as a lizard-slayer known through a description by Pliny.⁸²

In 1728, the Richardsons suggested that the same coin noted above in the French royal collection might indicate that the Belvedere Venus, in 1616 wrongly identified as a Venus by Phidias, might be a copy of the Venus of Cnidus by Praxiteles.⁸³ During the central decades of the eighteenth century, —the period of Winckelmann, Mengs and Lessing— the concern to give a general interpretation to the ancient arts overtook the research of «fixed points». Consequently, the tendency towards attribution slowed. However, Winckelmann had suggested that the many copies of the Resting Satyr derived from Praxiteles' Satyr *Periboetos*, «very famous».⁸⁴

Soon after, however, with the rising concern in the systematisation of knowledge typical of the Napoleonic period, scholars became increasingly interested in attribution of ancient works of art. E.Q. Visconti, the Director of the Musée Napoleon at Paris, for example, proposed a rich network of attributions and gave the first real voice to the possibility that the comparison among the copies allowed the restitution of the iconography of an original, just as the comparison among the manuscripts of an ancient literary work allowed the restoration of the first edition of that work. Visconti's aim, of course, was to reach, through these attributions, a knowledge of styles of different periods rather than to give insight into the specific styles of single masters.⁸⁵ In the first

⁷⁹ See Pliny 36.28 and Haskell and Penny (nt. 76) 274. My opinion against this attribution has been written in my book (nt. 62) 105–106.

⁸⁰ See E. Spanhemius, *Dissertationes de praestantia et usu numismatum antiquorum*, Amsterdam 2 (1717²) 296.

⁸¹ See Archelaus and Cercidas in Athenaeus 12. 554c–e and Haskell and Penny (nt. 76) 317. However, the Kallipygos Aphrodite should be rather identified with the Landolina type of this goddess: see A. Giuliano, *Scritti minori*, Rome (2001) 25–30.

⁸² See Pliny 34.70 and Martial 14. 172; Haskell and Penny (nt. 76) 151–153.

⁸³ See Haskell and Penny (nt. 76) 330–331; S. Deswarte-Rosa, «Francisco de Hollanda et le Cortile di Belvedere», M. Winner *et alii* (eds.), *Il cortile delle statue*, Mainz (1998) 402–406.

⁸⁴ See Pliny 34.69; Haskell and Penny (nt. 76) 210.

⁸⁵ A summary of Visconti's suggestions is offered by F. Zevi, «Visconti, Ennio Quirino», *EAA* 7 (1966) 1187–1188. See also Giuliano (nt. 81) 163–172.

half of the nineteenth century, Sillig,⁸⁶ Thiersch⁸⁷ and Müller⁸⁸ continued to use this manner of attribution in order to define the styles of different ages.

In mid-nineteenth century Germany, however, a different academic trend was taking shape: the use of attributions to restore the styles and careers of single masters. This tendency is clear already in the publications of Welcker,⁸⁹ Jahn,⁹⁰ Brunn,⁹¹ Friederichs,⁹² Ulrichs,⁹³ Benndorf,⁹⁴ Stark,⁹⁵ Overbeck⁹⁶ and Michaelis.⁹⁷ For these scholars, reconstructing the artistic curricula of Classical masters through Roman copies was a way to overcome the fragmentary state of our knowledge of the ancient world as well as to assimilate the study of ancient to that of modern art. The publications of these authors are particularly noteworthy, both for their immense erudition regarding all aspects of Classical culture and for their interdisciplinary and synthetic methodology which sought to merge all available source of data, be it epigraphical, literary, or archaeological. It was here that the study of the Classical world reached its zenith.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, two considerations heightened scholars' interest in the restoration of *oeuvres* and careers of ancient masters. The first was the introduction of Morelli's method of identifying the hand of an artist by observing minute details within his work, then thought to be related to the artist's training.⁹⁸ The

⁸⁶ See J. Sillig, *Catalogus artificum*, Dresden (1827).

⁸⁷ See F. Thiersch, *Über die Epochen der bildenden Kunst unter den Griechen*, München (1829).

⁸⁸ See C.O. Müller, *Handbook der Archäologie der Kunst*, Breslau (1830). See K. Fittschen, «Karl Otfried Müller und die Archäologie», W. M. Calder *et alii* (eds.), *Zwischen Rationalismus und Romantik: Karl Otfried Müller und die antike Kultur*, Hildesheim (1998) 187–216.

⁸⁹ See F.G. Welcker, *Alte Denkmäler*, Göttingen, 5 vols. (1849–1864). See also W. Geominy, «Die Welckersche Archäologie», W.M. Calder *et alii* (eds.), *Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker: Werk und Wirkung*, Stuttgart (1986) 230–250; N. Himmelmann, «Die Archäologie im Werk F.G. Welckers», *ibidem* 277–280.

⁹⁰ See especially O. Jahn, *Archäologische Beiträge*, Berlin (1847); Idem, *Über die Kunsturteile bei Plinius, sine loco* (1850). See W. Ehrhardt, *Das akademische Kunstmuseum der Universität Bonn unter der Direktion von Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker und Otto Jahn*, Opladen (1982).

⁹¹ See especially H. Brunn, *Geschichte der Griechischen Künstler* 1, Braunschweig (1853).

⁹² See especially K. Friederichs, *Praxiteles und die Niobegruppe*, Leipzig (1855); Idem, *Der Doryphoros des Polyklet*, Berlin (1863); Idem, *Die Gypsabgüsse antiker Bildwerke in historischer Folge erklärt. Bausteine zur Geschichte der Griechisch-Römischen Plastik*, Berlin (1885).

⁹³ See C.L. Ulrichs, *Observationes de arte Praxitelis*, Würzburg (1858); Idem, *Skopas; Leben und Werke*, Greifswald (1863); Idem, *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte*, Leipzig (1885).

⁹⁴ Among the many important publications by this Austrian scholar, I cite here only: O. Benndorf, *De anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae ad artes spectant*, Leipzig (1862); Idem, «Tituli statuariorum sculptorumque Graecorum», *GGA* 16 (1871) 1. 601–625; Idem, «Sopra una statua di giovane nel Palazzo dei Conservatori», *BullComm* 14 (1886) 54–76; Idem, «Über einem in Eleusis gefundenen Marmorkopf», *WienAnzeig* 25 (1887) 151–156.

⁹⁵ See K.B. Stark, *Niobe und die Niobiden in ihrer literarischen, künstlerischen und mythologischen Bedeutung*, Leipzig (1863); Idem, «Skopas und seine Werke», *Philologus* 21 (1864) 415–453; Idem, «Die Erosbildungen des Praxiteles», *BerSächGessWiss* 18 (1866) 155–172.

⁹⁶ See especially J. Overbeck, *Geschichte der Griechischen Plastik*, Leipzig (1857–1858).

⁹⁷ See A. Michaelis, «Die Vaticanischen Repliken der Knidischen Aphrodite», *AZ* 34 (1876) 145–149; Idem, «The Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles», *JHS* 8 (1887) 324–354; Idem, *Altattische Kunst*, Strassburg (1893).

⁹⁸ See especially G. Morelli (I. Lermolieff), *Die Werke Italienischer Meister in den Galerien von München, Dresden und Berlin*, Leipzig (1880); Idem, *Kunstkritische Studien*, *ibidem* (1890).

second was the wide-spread acceptance of the reasoning that the catalogues of works of Greek masters by Pliny depended on the catalogue of *opera nobilia* in five books composed by the sculptor Pasiteles in the second quarter of the first century BC,⁹⁹ that the choice of monuments to copy depended from Pasiteles catalogue and that it was therefore possible to identify systematically the artistic creations mentioned by Pliny in the works surviving in Roman copies.¹⁰⁰ This, then, was the season of Furtwängler,¹⁰¹ Treu,¹⁰² C. Robert,¹⁰³ Klein,¹⁰⁴ Kekule' (who fought against this trend),¹⁰⁵ Rumpf,¹⁰⁶ Löwy,¹⁰⁷ Wolters,¹⁰⁸ Studniczka,¹⁰⁹ Bruckmann,¹¹⁰ Amelung¹¹¹ and Kalkmann.¹¹² In the decades before the First World War, it was thought that the definition of the styles of the key Classical Greek masters had been acquired.

After the First World War, the prevailing idealistic culture caused a shift of interest away the studies of single masters towards the definitions of the main features of various art historical periods. Nationalistic concerns also led scholars to determine the stylistic distinctions between what was «Greek» and what was «Roman», thereby devaluing

⁹⁹ Pasiteles' catalogue is mentioned by Pliny 36.39.

¹⁰⁰ Good summaries of the most important critical contributions to the study of Pliny's three books on ancient visual arts (Pliny, *Naturalis historia* 34; 35; and 36) of the last decades of the nineteenth century and of the first ones of the twentieth century can be found in S. Ferri, *Plinio il Vecchio: storia delle arti antiche*, Rome (1946) 5–17; and J. Pollitt, *The ancient View of Greek Art*, New Haven (1974) 73–81.

¹⁰¹ See, of course, especially A. Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke der Griechischen Plastik*, Leipzig (1893), probably the most important book on ancient Greek sculpture which has ever been published; also, Idem, *Plinius und seine Quellen über die bildende Künste*, *ibidem* (1877); and Idem, *Über Statuenkopieen im Alterthum*, München (1896).

¹⁰² See especially G. Treu, *Hermes mit dem Dionysosknaben*, Berlin (1878).

¹⁰³ See especially C. Robert, *Archäologische Märchen*, Berlin (1886); Idem, «Die Nekyia des Polygnot», *Hallisches Winckelmannsprogramm* 16 (1892); Idem, «Die Iliupersis des Polygnot», *ibidem* 17 (1893); Idem, «Die Marathonschlacht in der Poikile und Weiteres über Polygnot», *ibidem* 18 (1895); Idem, *Archäologische Hermeneutik*, Berlin (1919).

¹⁰⁴ See W. Klein, «Studien zur Griechischen Künstlergeschichte», *ÖstMitt* 4 (1880) 1–25; Idem, *Praxiteles*, Leipzig (1898); Idem, *Praxitelische Studien*, *ibidem* (1899); Idem, *Geschichte der Griechischen Kunst*, Leipzig (1904–1907).

¹⁰⁵ See especially R. Kekulé von Stradonitz, *Die Griechische Skulptur*, Berlin (1906). He has been the first who objected to the use of Roman copies in order to reconstruct ancient Greek sculpture: see on him, W. Geominy, *Das akademische Kunstmuseum der Universität Bonn unter der Direktion von Reinhard Kekulé*, Amsterdam (1989).

¹⁰⁶ See H. Rumpf, «Die Hermesstatue aus dem Heratempel zu Olympia», *Philologus* 40 (1881) 197–220.

¹⁰⁷ See E. Löwy, *Untersuchungen zur Griechischen Künstlergeschichte*, Wien (1883); Idem, *Inchriften Griechischer Bildhauer*, Leipzig (1895); Idem, *Lysipp*, Hamburg (1891); Idem, *Die Griechische Plastik*, Leipzig (1916); Idem, *Polygnot*, Wien (1929).

¹⁰⁸ See P. Wolters, «Die Eroten des Praxiteles», *AZ* 43 (1885) 82–98; Idem, *Polyklets Doryphoros*, München (*sine data*); Idem, «Der Eros des Praxiteles in Parion», *SBerAkadMünch* (1913) 4.21–40.

¹⁰⁹ See F. Studniczka, *Kalamis*, Leipzig (1907); Idem, *Das Symposion Ptolemaios ii nach der Beschreibung des Kalliximos wieder gestellt*, *ibidem* (1914); Idem, *Artemis und Iphigenie*, *ibidem* (1926).

¹¹⁰ See H. Brunn and F. Bruckmann (eds.), *Denkmäler Griechischer und Römischer Skulptur*, München, vols. 1–8 (1897–1947).

¹¹¹ See W. Amelung, *Die Basis des Praxiteles aus Mantinea*, München (1895); P. Arndt and W. Amelung (eds.), *Photographische Einzelaufnahmen antiker Skulpturen*, München, vols. 1–6 (1893–1947).

¹¹² See A. Kalkmann, *Die Proportionen des Gesichts in der Griechischen Kunst*, Berlin (1893); Idem, *Die Quellen der Kunstgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin (1898).

Roman copies. To this was added the idealistic notion of an art object's «uniqueness». In this intellectual environment, scholars were inclined to think that even the best copy could reveal only the basic patterns of an original, not its soul. Still, the tradition of the previous generations in the field of the *Meisterforschung* was too strong not to have followers. Many studies within this particular sub-field continued to appear. This was the generation of Rodenwaldt,¹¹³ Poulsen,¹¹⁴ Lippold,¹¹⁵ Bieber,¹¹⁶ Richter,¹¹⁷ Picard,¹¹⁸ Schweitzer,¹¹⁹ Blinkenberg¹²⁰ and Ashmole.¹²¹ From a methodological point of view, these scholars distinguished themselves from their predecessors by a closer attention to artistic evidence that was contemporary —or not much later— than the assumed originals, especially architectural sculpture, through which the styles of the great masters might be indirectly revealed. Thus, Schweitzer attempted to find the art of Phidias more in the Parthenon sculpture than in Roman copies.¹²²

The need to give a «pure» picture of Greek art —freed from any consideration of Roman copies— also led to the open criticism of the use of copies in studies of Greek sculpture as well as to scepticism regarding the conclusions reached by previous generations of scholars. After Kekule's original objections,¹²³ Blümel¹²⁴ and Carpenter¹²⁵ were the most important critics of the methods of the old school.

After the Second World War, the prevailing interest in the reconstruction of the social aspects of the Greek world led scholars to consider the means of artistic production rather than the personalities of great masters. This sociological approach to the ancient world, was concerned more with patrons and viewers than artists. This interest in patrons and viewers as well as the social context of art also effected the consideration of

¹¹³ See G. Rodenwaldt, *Die Kunst der Antike*, Berlin (1927); Idem, «Theoi rheia zootes», *Abh. der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse* 13 (1943) 3–24.

¹¹⁴ See F. Poulsen, *Den klassiske Graeske Kunst*, Kobenhavn (1943).

¹¹⁵ See G. Lippold, *Kopien und Umbildungen Griechischer Statuen*, München (1923); Idem, «Zur Griechischen Künstlergeschichte», *JdI* 38–39 (1923–1924) 150–158; Idem, *Die Griechische Plastik*, München (1950).

¹¹⁶ See M. Bieber, «Die Söhne des Praxiteles», *JdI* 38–39 (1923–1924) 242–275; Eadem, «Die Koische Aphrodite des Praxiteles», *ZeitschrNum* 34 (1924) 315–320; Eadem, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, New York (1955); Eadem, *Ancient Copies*, *ibidem* (1977).

¹¹⁷ See G.M.A. Richter, *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*, New Haven (1929); Eadem, «The Hermes of Praxiteles», *AJA* 35 (1931) 277–290.

¹¹⁸ See especially C. Picard, *Manuel d'Archéologie Grecque. La sculpture*, Paris 2 (1939); 3 (1948); 4.1 (1954); 2 (1963).

¹¹⁹ See especially B. Schweitzer, «Prolegomena zur Kunst des Parthenon-Meisters I», *JdI* 53 (1938) 1–89; Idem, «Zur Kunst der Parthenon-Meisters ii», *ibidem* 54 (1939) 1–96; Idem, «Phidias der Parthenonmeister», *ibidem* 55 (1940) 170–241.

¹²⁰ See C. Blinkenberg, *L'image d'Athana Lindia*, Kobenhavn (1917); Idem, *Knidia*, *ibidem* (1933).

¹²¹ See B. Ashmole, «Hygieia on Acropolis and Palatine», *Papers of the British School at Rome* 10 (1927) 1–11.

¹²² See nt. 119.

¹²³ See nt. 105.

¹²⁴ See C. Blümel, *Griechische Bildhauerarbeit*, Berlin (1927); Idem, *Der Hermes eines Praxiteles*, Baden-Baden (1944).

¹²⁵ See R. Carpenter, *The esthetic Basis of Greek Art of the fifth and fourth Centuries B.C.*, Bryn Mawr (1921); Idem, «Observations on familiar Statuary in Rome», *MAAR* 18 (1941) 1–1–5; Idem, *Greek Sculpture*, Chicago (1960).

Roman copies as an aspect of the Roman society. Under this banner, copyist types were studied as distinctly Roman creations as opposed to reflections of Greek originals. This trend in scholarship, anticipated already by Homann Wedeking, who considered the Esquiline Charioteer (fig. 7) «classicistic»,¹²⁶ and Schuchhardt,¹²⁷ has been emphasised by Zanker, himself a student of Schuchhardt,¹²⁸ and by younger scholars, sensible to Zanker's methodology such as Landwehr¹²⁹ and M. Fuchs.¹³⁰

On the other side, a revised study of the ancient masters has been making steady progress now finding its basis in fragmentary materials thought to come from the master's workshop or in near contemporary secondary evidence which echoes lost masterpieces. Ashmole pioneered this trend with his study of Leochares based on supposed Late Classical originals as the Demeter of Cnidus and the portrait of Alexander in the Museum of the Acropolis¹³¹ (fig. 8). Stewart, a well established student of Ashmole, rethought the study of Scopas on the basis of the original sculptures as the pediments of Tegea and the sculpture of the Mausoleum.¹³² Despinis revitalised the study of Agoracritus, basing it on the preserved original fragments of his Nemesis at Rhamnus,¹³³ while Delivorrias discovered a fragment of the original statue of the «Olympias/Aphrodite»¹³⁴ and identified the copyist tradition of the Gardens' Aphrodite by Alcamenes also on the ground of a Classical relief.¹³⁵

One last trend in the history of the study of ancient masters might finally be mentioned. This school of thought, which can be fairly characterised as empirical, is particularly widespread in the United States. The common element in this variety of scholarship is the assumption that many copyist types or even most of them do not reflect Greek originals but rather are Roman classicistic creations. Robertson, after Carpenter, pioneered this trend, when he suggested that the Soranzo Eros was a classicistic creation,¹³⁶ thereby denying the connection of the Crouching type of Aphrodite (fig. 9)

¹²⁶ See E. Homann-Wedeking, «Zu Meisterwerken des Strengen Stils», *RM* 55 (1940) 196–218.

¹²⁷ See W. H. Schuchhardt, *Griechische Plastik der klassischen Zeit*, Stuttgart (1954); Idem, *Die Epochen der Griechischen Plastik*, Baden-Baden (1959); Idem, *Griechische Kunst*, Stuttgart (1968); B. S. Ridgway, «The bronze Apollo from Piombino in the Louvre», *Antike Plastik* 7 (1967) 43, thanks «Professor Walter-Herwig Schuchhardt, who encouraged» her «to undertake this study», i. e. to write her theory on the Piombino Apollo, down-dated to the first century B.C. Moreover, Prof. Klaus Fittschen has informed me that Zanker's theory that the «Apollo del Tevere» is classicistic had been asserted first of all by Schuchhardt in his university lectures.

¹²⁸ See especially P. Zanker, *Klassizistische Statuen*, Mainz am Rhein (1974).

¹²⁹ See especially C. Landwehr, *Die Römischen Skulpturen von Caesarea Mauretaniae*, Berlin 1 (1993); 2 (2000).

¹³⁰ See M. Fuchs, *In hoc etiam genere Graeciae nihil cedamus: Studien zur Romanisierung der späthellenistischen Kunst im 1. Jh. v. Chr.*, Mainz (1999).

¹³¹ See B. Ashmole, «Demeter of Cnidus», *JHS* 71 (1951) 13–28; Idem, «Solvitur disputando», U. Höckmann and A. Krug (eds.), *Festschrift für Frank Brommer*, Mainz/Rhein (1977) 13–20.

¹³² See A. Stewart, *Skopas of Paros*, Park Ridge (1977).

¹³³ See Despinis (nt. 16).

¹³⁴ See nt. 15.

¹³⁵ See A. Delivorrias, «Die Kultstatue der Aphrodite von Daphni», *Antike Plastik* 8 (1968) 19–31.

¹³⁶ See B.S. Ridgway, *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton (1970) 132, nt. 2: «M. Robertson suggests to me that the upturned look of the Eros may imply that he was in a group with a larger figure (Aphrodite?) and that such a group can be more easily conceived in 'Pasitelean' than in fifth century terms».

with the sculptor Doidalsas, mentioned by Pliny as the master of the *Venus lavans sese*. Robertson even went so far as to doubt of the existence of Doidalsas¹³⁷ and to disparage important copies as those of Apollo Sauroctonus.¹³⁸ Epigraphist Jeffery contributed to this trend when she down-dated the inscription on the foot of the Apollo from Piombino on the basis of the systematic use of the *argumentum e silentio* : since not all of the shapes of letters of this inscription are attested in fifth century BC inscriptions, the inscription should be downdated to the first century BC.¹³⁹ Jeffery and Robertson encouraged Ridgway¹⁴⁰ and Palagia¹⁴¹ to apply the empiricist method to the study of sculpture; at present, Ridgway,¹⁴² Mattusch¹⁴³ and Palagia¹⁴⁴ are perhaps the most assertive proponents of this trend. Ridgway has down-dated several sculptural types usually assigned to the Classical period, included the Riace bronzes.¹⁴⁵ Mattusch has down-dated the Piraeus Apollo, the torso of Vani, the Getty Athlete, the Belvedere Apollo and the Versailles Artemis¹⁴⁶ while Palagia has down-dated the Dresden type of Maenad, attributed usually to Scopas,¹⁴⁷ to the Late Hellenistic period and supports a late Hellenistic date for the Piraeus Apollo.¹⁴⁸

Several intellectual factors seem to contribute to this popular method:

1. A primitivist conception of Classical art, characterised by the belief in stylistic uniformity by region and period. Images that cannot find «matches» within any given stylistic milieu are thus removed from Classical period and downdated. This conception of Classical art is consistent with the equally primitivistic image of Archaic and Classical Greek societies given by Polanyi,¹⁴⁹ Finley,¹⁵⁰ Snodgrass,¹⁵¹ Osborne¹⁵² and others.¹⁵³

¹³⁷ See M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, Cambridge (1975) 1. 557: «By a series of 'corrections' in corrupt passages of Pliny and others this (*scil.*: the Crouching Aphrodite) has been ascribed to a hypothetical Bithynian sculptor, Doidalsas, active in the third century; but no reliance can be placed on this airy construction». The passage of Pliny referred to is 36.35. This passage does not seem to me corrupt and the Latinized version of the name Doidalsas appears there without any correction: *fecerunt (...) Venerem lavantem sese Daedalsas* (so *codex Bambergensis*: this manuscript of Pliny's *Natural History* is unanimously regarded as the best).

¹³⁸ See Robertson (nt. 137) 389: «The rather repellent quality one tends, I think, to feel in the plump body of the Sauroktonos».

¹³⁹ See Ridgway (nt. 127) 66–67.

¹⁴⁰ See Ridgway (nts. 127 and 139).

¹⁴¹ Dr. C. Peppas Delmouzou has made me aware that Jeffery encouraged Palagia to use this methodology in sculpture.

¹⁴² See, for an example of advise of Robertson to Ridgway, nt. 136. Among Ridgway's many publications, see especially *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture*, Ann Arbor (1984).

¹⁴³ See C. Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes*, Ithaca (1996).

¹⁴⁴ See in particular O. Palagia, «Reflections on the Piraeus Bronzes», O. Palagia (ed.), *Greek Offerings. Essays on Greek Art in Honour of John Boardmann*, Oxford (1997) 117–195.

¹⁴⁵ See B. S. Ridgway, «The Riace Bronzes: a minority Viewpoint», *BdA*, Ser. sp. 3. 2 (1984) 313–326.

¹⁴⁶ See nt. 143.

¹⁴⁷ O. Palagia has asserted it in a lecture held in the American School of Classical Studies at Athens in the fall of 1994. I had attended that lecture. This suggestion seems not to have reached yet a published form.

¹⁴⁸ See nt. 144.

¹⁴⁹ See K. Polanyi, *Primitive, Archaic, and Modern Economies*, Gordon City (1968).

¹⁵⁰ See especially M. Finley, *The Ancient Greeks*, London (1963); Idem, *The Ancient Economy*, *ibidem* (1973); Idem, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, *ibidem* (1980); Idem, *Ancient History*, *ibidem* (1985).

According to these scholars, the Greeks were a small population, most of them were illiterate, primitive economically, with a limited life span characterised by very early marriages for girls, etc. This picture of ancient Greek society is hardly convincing. Ancient Greek population figures and densities are now based mainly on archaeological knowledge, which is, of course, partial and constitutes only a small part of ancient settlements. The voting system of Classical Athens and the institution of the ostracism prove that the majority of Classical Athenian citizens were able to read and write.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, a study by J.P. Wilson has shown that the Greek economy was based on substantial registrations of trade activities already during the archaic period.¹⁵⁵ There is also evidence that it was not uncommon to live until seventy.¹⁵⁶ Finally, it is more likely that the standard marrying age for girls was not fifteen, but rather the late teens.¹⁵⁷ The insistence in ancient Greek literature on young girls, both in myth and life, as having love affairs in an age placed between childhood and marriage suggests that ancient Greek girls experienced romance before marriage more often than it is usually suspected.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵¹ See especially A. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece*, Edinburgh (1971); Idem, *Archaic Greece*, London (1980); Idem, *Homer and the Artists*, Cambridge (1998).

¹⁵² See especially R. Osborne, *Greece in the making, 1200–479 B.C.*, London (1996); and Idem, *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*, Oxford (1998).

¹⁵³ See especially B. Cohen (ed.), *Not the Classical Ideal*, Leiden (2000).

¹⁵⁴ This footnote and the following ones are of course not the right places to discuss so difficult and debated topics as are the ones raised here. The following observations aim therefore just at suggesting points of view which are alternative to the ones asserted by the scholars mentioned above. I hope to be able to develop these ideas in the near future. Concerning ostracism, several ancient writers (Philostratus, *Atthis*, frg. 30 Jacoby; Cornelius Nepos, *Aristides* 1.2–4; Diodorus 11.55.2 and 87.1; Plutarch, *Aristides* 7.5–6) make it clear that voters inscribed their *ostraka*, writing on them the names of the citizens whom they wished to remove from the city. The great variety of writing styles among most of the *ostraka* found in the Athenian agora confirms that most citizens inscribed their *ostraka* on their own (see M.L. Lang, *Ostraka, The Athenian Agora* 25, Princeton (1990) 8–18). The presence of *ostraka* professionally prepared and mass-produced for distribution, probably from political parties, had been argued with high probability only in the two exceptional cases of the Themistocles' *ostraka* found in the north slope of the Acropolis and of the Kallixenos sherds (see Lang 161) and was therefore probably not the rule. On Athenian ostracism, see S. Brenne, *Ostrakismos und Prominenz in Athen*, Wien (2001).

¹⁵⁵ See J.P. Wilson, «The 'Illiterate Trader'», *BICS* 42 (1997–1998) 29–56.

¹⁵⁶ The famous statement by Solon, frg. 20 Gerber «may my fated death come at eighty» reveals that reaching that age was not thought to be very unlikely. Equally, the statement by Mimnermus, frg. 6 Gerber «my fated death might come at sixty, unattended by sickness and grievous cares» (transl. Loeb) shows that dying at sixty was regarded as dying early already around 600 B.C. A study of the length of lives of many famous persons would show that dying at seventy was regarded as normal: both Pericles and Socrates died at seventy, while Isocrates survived until 98 and Gorgias until 109.

¹⁵⁷ The statues of korai dedicated in Greek sanctuaries and cemeteries look to me older than fifteen and were certainly imagined as still unmarried girls (see, e.g., *IG* i³ 1261). Moreover, the age of the late fifth century B.C. *virgo civis Corinthia jam matura nuptiis*, whose tombstone has inspired to Callimachus the creation of the Corinthian capital (Vitruvius 4.1.9), can be specified. The tombstone of an unmarried girl, Claudia Toreuma, who had died near Padua in northern Italy, in the early Julio–Claudian period, bears a shape which constitutes an allusion to the tombstone of that Corinthian girl. The inscription on this tombstone specifies that Claudia Toreuma died when she was nineteen (see *CIL* 5.2931): so, the Corinthian girl *jam matura nuptiis* must have had approximately the same age.

¹⁵⁸ I give here only a few examples of love affairs between men or boys and unmarried girls, who were not courtesans, taken from real life and dated to the archaic period. The daughter of the potter Boutades of Sicyon (seventh century B.C.), living in Corinth, was sleeping together with her boy–friend, in the house of her father, who accepted that relationship (Pliny 35.151; Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* 17). Archilochus,

Accordingly, a sophisticated society may well have been characterised by the presence of different styles in the same time and space. Classical Athens was a pluralistic society in which multiple opinions in politics, philosophy, history, poetry and religion existed side by side. Would this pluralism not logically extend to the visual arts as well?

2. The tendency to give a later date to many sculptural types and regard them as Roman classicistic creations seems based on a failure to consider that only a small fraction of what existed in antiquity has survived. For example, in the realm of marble sculpture, less than one per cent of total production has survived. In the case of bronze sculpture the percentage is far less. The argument that a creation has not been conceived in the Classical period because not all of its stylistic features can be compared to similar ones of other surviving works of that period (the so-called *argumentum e silentio*) is not convincing, as Andronikos had rightly stressed,¹⁵⁹ because, quite simply, far too little has survived from the shipwreck of antiquity to allow someone to think in these terms. In fact, it is quite likely that sculptural styles that existed in the Classical period are entirely unknown to us, as more than 99% of Classical antiquity has disappeared. The refrain *etiam perierunt ruinae* applies perfectly in this circumstance.

To illustrate the dangerous consequences of this methodology, let us consider one statue whose date is particularly controversial: the Piraeus Apollo (fig. 10). A few scholars have down-dated this statue to Late Hellenistic times, because not all of its stylistic features have solid comparanda in the Late Archaic and in the Severe style periods.¹⁶⁰ Thus, an American scholar has concluded: «The figure's many abnormalities suggest a date as late as the second century BC».¹⁶¹ The key question that should be raised is: abnormalities in comparison to *what*? How many life-size bronzes exist, even in fragments, from the early fifth century BC? Is the number sufficient to allow us to speak of abnormalities? By this reasoning, no bronze statue could be dated to pre-Classical periods, because abnormalities will be always found. With regard to the Piraeus Apollo, a few observations forwarded by Formigli deserve our attention: «A few technical details seem to confirm the Archaic date of the bronze: the thickness (6–11 mm), the type of repair's strips and the absence of welding between torso and legs. Karziha (scil.: the first restorer of the bronze) told me that he had found yellow clay on the areas of the bronze corresponding to the junction of the arms to the torso, different from the reddish clay found on the areas of the bronze which are close to the iron bars inside the body and different from the grey clay which was closer to the surface of the bronze. That is the stuccoing clay, inserted in order to avoid the dispersion of the liquid bronze poured as welder. Even on the areas of the bronze which are close to the neck, there was filling material, in that case made of white round pebbles. Here Karziha had noted, even

still in the seventh century B.C., claimed to have had love affairs with both the unmarried daughters of Lycambes, inside the sanctuary of Hera on Paros (the elder daughter, Neobule, was told to have had many lovers) (see Archilochus, *testimonia* 19–32 and *frgg.* 33; 38; 118; 172–173; 196a; 206; 223; 294 Gerber). Equally, Alcman (seventh century B.C.) loved the poetess Megalostрата, who was able to attract her lovers by her conversation (see Alcman, *frg.* 59 Campbell). Mimnermus (around 600 B.C.) loved Nanno (see Mimnermus, *testimonia* 3–5; *frg.* 4–5 and 24 Gerber). I do not give any of the many possible examples for later periods. I wish just to observe that the standard couple in Greek novels is a man, or a boy, and an unmarried girl.

¹⁵⁹ See M. Andronikos, «Argumentum e silentio», *AAA* 13 (1980) 354–365.

¹⁶⁰ See the publications cited in nts. 130; 143 and 144.

¹⁶¹ K. Lapatin, review to Rolley (nt. 6), «Bonner Jahrbücher» 197 (1997) 463–469, precisely 469.

directly, horizontal debarring of the bronze, due apparently to the welding material. On the contrary, there were no traces of connection at the junction of the legs to the torso. During the Roman period, when the production of copies or of antiquarian remaking could be made even without the presence of the master of the first model, the adopted techniques inclined to the mechanisation of the necessary operations» (translation from Italian by A. Corso).¹⁶² These technical details suggest an early period of experimentation and insecurity. The Piraeus Apollo is probably not later than early fifth century.

3. A tendency to think that most of the surviving ancient writers who speak of Classical works of art are too late (from the first century BC to the third century A.D.) to be reliable. Scholars who share this opinion often forget that these writers of Roman times take their information from early Hellenistic art critics. These same authors could have seen many tens or even hundreds of original statues made by the greatest masters which are now lost. When a learned writer has seen the Zeus of Olympia, the Athena Parthenos, the Doryphorus by Polycleitos, the Hera of Argos, the Discus-thrower by Myron and hundreds of masterpieces by the greatest masters he might, perhaps, attribute to a master a work made by a pupil, but he would hardly make mistakes of centuries in his attributions. Would an undergraduate art historian ever confuse a work of the early renaissance with a work of the baroque period? In a similar manner, the notion that Pliny and Callistratus wrongly attribute to the fourth century BC sculptor Scopas works made in fact by a name-sake of the late second century BC¹⁶³ seems unlikely. Even now, an art historian generally aware of the development of the history of painting is able to determine if a painting was made in 1450 or 1550 or 1650, and if the image is Florentine or Venetian or Flemish, simply on the basis of having been to several museums, because most of the works of art made during those periods still survive. Pliny, who had admired many masterpieces by Greek artists brought to Rome, could hardly have made such mistakes.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, as it was stressed above, Classical art is already treated as the product of unique personalities in the work of Aristophanes, Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle. This attitude probably finds its roots in the philosophy of the Sophists such as Protagoras, Gorgias and Callias, concerned as they were with the subjective aspects of human life.

This trend to minimise the importance of ancient literary references to works of art has the unfortunate outcome that it encourages Classical archaeologists to neglect ancient sources, thereby undervaluing the acquisition of such knowledge.

The danger of this trend is evidenced by two passages from recent scholarship.

Regarding the Athena and Marsyas by Myron (fig. 11), Ridgway notes: «Pliny's passage alone (*NH* 34.57) is not sufficient to prove that the two figures (scil.: of Athena and Marsyas by Myron) were juxtaposed in a single composition; indeed, Pollitt's translation introduces a comma between the listing of the two works, thus breaking the connection. The original Latin text has no such punctuation as an aid to the interpretation».¹⁶⁵ Professor Ridgway seems unaware that punctuation does not exist in

¹⁶² E. Formigli, «Tecnica e creazione artistica. La saldatura nella statuaria in bronzo antica», Idem (ed.), *I grandi bronzi antichi*, Siena (1999) 83–90, precisely 85.

¹⁶³ On this theory, see nt. 147 and especially F. Coarelli, *Il Campo Marzio*, Rome (1997) 407–496.

¹⁶⁴ A demonstration that Pliny has never made so glaring mistakes had been attempted by A. Corso, «A Group of Tyrant-slayers made by Praxiteles», *Xenia Antiqua* 10 (2001), 5–10.

¹⁶⁵ See the book cited in nt. 136, 85.

the manuscript tradition and is restored by modern editors. The presence of comma is thus irrelevant in a critical edition and is of course even more irrelevant in translations, even if the text is potentially ambiguous.

Another illuminating example concerns the statue of Phryne at Delphi, about which Mattusch claims: «We know of no golden mortal women before the Roman period, unless the golden statue of Phryne at Delphi was, as Athenaeus alleges, made by her lover, Praxiteles. Note 76: Athenaeus 13.591 B. Because Athenaeus lived in the second century A.D., it can easily be argued that he may not be a reliable source on this point».¹⁶⁶

We may note that:

1. the Phryne at Delphi by Praxiteles was known not just to Athenaeus, but to no less than seven ancient sources, from Dio Chrysostomus to Plutarch (three passages), from Pausanias to Aelian, from Diogenes Laertius to Athenaeus and Libanius.¹⁶⁷

2. Athenaeus in the passage *quotes* (not *cites*) Alcetas, an antiquarian who lived in the early second century BC and wrote a catalogue of dedications at Delphi.¹⁶⁸ The portrait of Phryne cannot be Roman.

3. Mattusch seems unaware that this statue was presumably not of gold but gilded, as specified by Plutarch and Pausanias.¹⁶⁹

4. Mattusch seems unaware that Athenaeus wrote in the third decade of the third century A.D. and is therefore not a second century A.D. writer.¹⁷⁰

5. Mattusch seems unaware that the subject of the statue was Aphrodite, according to Diogenes Laertius, Phryne having been the model of the statue as well as the dedicatee.¹⁷¹

A more balanced approach to the evidence reveals that several sculptural creations—now regarded as examples of Roman classicism—were, in fact, made during the classical period by masters mentioned by the ancient writers. This can be demonstrated on several levels.

First, the agreement between the evidence of Roman copyist types and ancient literary references to works of art having corresponding subjects is often very solid. Accordingly, it should lead to the conclusion that specific creations copied in Roman times coincide with famous masterpieces celebrated by ancient writers.

A good example of this is the Belvedere Apollo (fig. 12). It is a well-established opinion that this type constitutes the copyist tradition of a bronze statue of Apollo Patroos in the agora of Athens, mentioned by Pausanias 1.3.4 and made by Leochares around the middle of the fourth century BC.¹⁷² However, it has been asserted that, since the Belvedere Apollo is the sole example of its type, it does not derive from a Greek bronze original, but is a purely Roman creation.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁶ See the book cited in nt. 143, 128.

¹⁶⁷ All of the passages on this statue have been listed by A. Corso, «The Monument of Phryne at Delphi», *NumAntCl* 26 (1997) 123–150, precisely 123, nt. 1.

¹⁶⁸ See Alcetas, *Peri ton en Delphois anathematon* 2, frg. 405. 1, *FGrHist* 3b Jacoby.

¹⁶⁹ See Plutarch, *Amatorius* 9 and Pausanias 10.15.1.

¹⁷⁰ See, e.g., E. Bowie, «Athenaios 3», *Der neue Pauly* 2 (1997) 196–199, specifically 197.

¹⁷¹ See Diogenes Laertius 6.2.60.

¹⁷² See, e.g., C. Rolley (nt. 6) 2 (1999) 290–292.

¹⁷³ See especially Mattusch (nt. 143) 141–148.

It is simply not true that the Belvedere statue is the sole example of its type. In fact, no less than seven ancient examples of the Belvedere Apollo are listed in the appropriate entry of the *LIMC*.¹⁷⁴ In addition, there are another two representations of the type in important Hellenistic relief-sculptures of Asia Minor, not included in the catalogue of the *LIMC*: the figure of Apollo on the southern section of the eastern side of the Gigantomachy frieze of the Altar of Pergamum¹⁷⁵ and the other on the western side of the Gigantomachy frieze of the temple of Artemis at Lagina.¹⁷⁶ This brings the number of examples of the Belvedere type to nine. Moreover, fragments of a cast, used in order to obtain copies from the bronze original of the Belvedere type of Apollo, were discovered at Baiae and published in 1985.¹⁷⁷ This cast, not in the *LIMC* catalogue, published a year earlier, constitutes thus a tenth example of the type and is conclusive evidence that the original was a bronze statue and that copies were made of this statue from casts in Roman times. The discovery of casts of Critius and Nesiotes' Tyrant-slayers and of Cephisodotus' Peace, both creations standing in the agora of Athens, at Baiae, together with the cast of our type,¹⁷⁸ makes it possible that the original statue of the Belvedere Apollo also stood there and does not counter the identification of the original as the statue of Apollo Patroos by Leochares, set up in the agora of Athens. More important, however, is the fact that the fragments of casts discovered at Baiae for which the original figures have been identified, have been found to derive from classical Greek bronze statues, an observation that further weakens the hypothesis that the original statue of the Belvedere type is later than the fourth century BC.

Among the copies pertinent to this type, the Steinhäuser head (fig. 13a) is certainly the most faithful to the original, as it reveals that the cold, academic rendering of the surfaces of the Vatican copy hides the typically Late Classical rendering with continual play of chiaroscuro.¹⁷⁹ A head which constitutes only a slight variation of the standard head of this type was found in the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus and probably belonged to a statue of Apollo¹⁸⁰ (fig. 13b). This head not only confirms that the original statue of the Belvedere type was created in Late Classical times, but also strongly suggests that the sculptor responsible for its creation may have been one of the masters who worked on the Mausoleum. Indeed, the general conception of the figure, the rendering of the surfaces and the anatomy and drapery which characterise the Belvedere Apollo are so blatantly similar to the corresponding features of a series of sculptural creations, as to make compelling the conclusion that these works had been made in the same workshop and conceived, if not actually made, by the same master. The creations which share the style of the Belvedere Apollo are:

¹⁷⁴ See W. Lambrinudakis, «Apollon», *LIMC* 2 (1984) 198–199, nos. 79a–f; E. Simon, «Apollon / Apollo», *ibidem* 381–382, no. 57.

¹⁷⁵ See Picard (nt. 118) 4. 2, 799, fig. 333; P. Moreno, *Scultura Ellenistica*, Rome (1994) 439, fig. 559; 465, fig. 588; and 474–475.

¹⁷⁶ See Picard (nt. 175) 801, fig. 335; and Moreno (nt. 175) 687, fig. 845.

¹⁷⁷ See Landwehr (nt. 10) 104–111.

¹⁷⁸ See Landwehr (nt. 10) 27–47 and 103–104.

¹⁷⁹ See this head in Rolley (nt. 172) 291, fig. 300.

¹⁸⁰ See G.B. Waywell, *The Free-standing Sculptures of the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus in the British Museum*, London (1978) 118–119, no. 48; Rolley (nt. 172) 291, fig. 301.

1. the Demeter from Cnidus (fig. 8);
2. the Acropolis/Erbach/Berlin type of Alexander (fig. 8);
3. the Fouquet type of Alexander;
4. the Versailles type of Artemis;
5. the Ince/Cyrene type of Zeus;
6. the Pacetti/Vatican type of Ganimedes kidnapped by the eagle;
7. the Apollo with a diadem at Basle;
8. and 9. the statues of Agelaus and Acnonius in the Daochus monument at Delphi;
10. slabs 1020–1021 and 1037 of the Amazonomachy frieze of the Mausoleum, British Museum, together with the head of Apollo mentioned above from the Mausoleum.¹⁸¹

The deep impact of this oeuvre in the fourth century as well as in the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial copies reveal that the sculptor was one of the very few Late Classical masters to achieve great fame while the participation of this sculptor in the creation of the sculptures of the Mausoleum restricts our search to the seven artists associated with the project by Vitruvius 7. *praef.* 12–13, and Pliny 36.30–31: Pytheus, Satyrus, Scopas, Bryaxis, Timotheus, Leochares and Praxiteles. Finally, the fact that a Ganimedes kidnapped by the eagle is included in this oeuvre confirms that this sculptor is Leochares, whose most famous work was a bronze group representing this episode (see Straton, *Anthologia Graeca* 12.221; Pliny 34.79; Martial 1.7; and Tatian 34). The original statue of the Belvedere Apollo was probably Leochares' Apollo Patroos standing in the agora of Athens. The setting of our statue in this prestigious square is also in keeping with the later fortune of this work, especially in the kingdom of the Attalids, whose interest in Athens and its Agora, where Attalus II built a portico, is well-known. The representation of Apollo as being ready to strike quickly is very appropriate to the fact that this god was conceived as Patroos, i. e. tutelary of the Athenians and a protecting god of the city.

Leochares probably made this statue in Athens around 360, and later, at Halicarnassus, made a similar marble Apollo whose head survives.

The type of sandals of the Belvedere Apollo bears an indentation between the big toe and the other toes, argued to be a later feature; but a similar indentation appears already in the Mausoleum,¹⁸² and therefore is not evidence for a later date.

The second way in which a more holistic approach can reveal the Classical origins of Roman copies is by way of careful examination of vase-painting, gems, reliefs and figurines that reflect originals already in the Classical period. Two examples are sufficient: the Soranzo Eros (fig. 14) has been considered classicistic by some scholars.¹⁸³ This type of Eros, however, was already represented on an Attic cup near the Fauvel Painter dated to around 440 BC, that clarifies Eros' activity: he is listening to the song of

¹⁸¹ See Ashmole, «Demeter, etc.» (nt. 131) 13–28; Picard (nt. 175) 754–854; J. Charbonneaux, «Le Zeus de Léochares», *Monuments Piot* 53 (1963) 9–17; P. Moreno, «L'immagine di Alessandro Magno nell'opera di Lisippo e di altri artisti contemporanei», *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici, Suppl.* 20 (1993) 101–136; Rolley (nt. 172) 288–294 and 307–317; and finally Corso (nt. 47) 141–146.

¹⁸² See Waywell (nt. 180) 155, no. 228, pl. 33; and Corso (nt. 47) 128–129, with nt. 10; 154, pl. 3, fig. 9; and 160, caption.

¹⁸³ See nt. 136.

a Muse.¹⁸⁴ It seems likely then, that this statue was a dedication in response to a poetic contest or maybe by a circle of poets who intended to celebrate Eros as a source of poetical inspiration. The most important free standing statue of Eros known in the literary tradition for the middle of the fifth century is probably the Eros by Phidias, known thanks to Athenaeus¹⁸⁵ as well as to an inscription on the base of a miniature ivory copy taken from it,¹⁸⁶ given the fact that this statue had been made by the most famous sculptor of all classical antiquity. Since this base shows that the Eros by Phidias was copied and since all three copies of the Soranzo type seem to have been found in the Greek world,¹⁸⁷ it is possible that the Soranzo type derives from the Eros by Phidias, which stood in Athens.¹⁸⁸

A second example of statues already reflected in the period of manufacture is the Dresden type of Maenad (fig. 15), which has been down-dated to the late-Hellenistic period.¹⁸⁹ However, an Amazon of the Amazonomachy frieze of the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus¹⁹⁰ already bears the basic iconographical features which characterise this creation, suggesting therefore that this type of Maenad derives from the Maenad of the late classical sculptor Scopas,¹⁹¹ one of the sculptors of the Mausoleum. The anatomy of the square face and, in particular, the shapes of the forehead, eyes-sockets and cheeks are so similar to the corresponding features of the surviving heads of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea¹⁹² (fig. 16) to make both a down-date of the Maenad and its removal from the oeuvre of Scopas rather unconvincing.

Another facet of ancient culture worth keeping in mind regarding the so-called Classicistic Roman creations is the status of the arts during the period in question. During the Late Republican and Early Imperial periods, it is commonly acknowledged that the visual arts entered a spiral of decay. People were therefore inclined to contemplate especially the creations of the glorious past. The clearest passages that refer to this widely shared opinion are:

Vitruvius 6. *praefatio* 6–7: «While I observe that an art of such magnificence (*scil.*: architecture) is professed by persons without training and experience, by those who are ignorant not only of architecture but even of construction, I cannot refrain from praising those owners of estates who (...) build for themselves, judging that if inexperienced persons are to be employed, they themselves are entitled to spend their own capital to their own liking rather than to that of anyone else. For no one attempts to practice any other calling at home, such as shoe-making (...) or fulling or any other easy occupation,

¹⁸⁴ See L. Burn and R. Glynn (eds.), *Beazley Addenda*, Oxford (1982) 178, no 1286; A. Hermay, «Eros», *LMC* 3 (1986) 910, no. 694a. ; T.H. Carpenter, *Beazley Addenda*, Oxford (1989) 358, no 1286.

¹⁸⁵ See Athenaeus 13.585 f.

¹⁸⁶ See M. Le Glay, «Un Eros de Phidias a Timgad», *Antiquités Africaines* 14 (1979) 129–133.

¹⁸⁷ The three copies are: 1. the Soranzo statue (see O. Waldhauer, *Die antiken Skulpturen der Ermitage* 2, Berlin (1931) 1–2, no. 85, pls. 1–2); 2. one torso at Oxford, Ashmolean Museum (see E.T. Leeds, *Ashmolean Museum, Summary Guide, Department of Antiquities*, Oxford (1931) 20); and 3. one statue at Sparta (see M.N. Tod and A.J. Wace, *A Catalogue of the Sparta Museum*, Oxford (1906) 123–124; 131; and 148, no. 94).

¹⁸⁸ See A. Corso, «The Eros of Phidias», *Periaptos* 3 (2001) 9–16.

¹⁸⁹ See nt. 147.

¹⁹⁰ See, e.g., Rolley (nt. 172) 311, fig. 324.

¹⁹¹ On the evidence on this creation, see Rolley (nt. 172) 272.

¹⁹² See the analytical argumentation by Rolley (nt. 172) 268–283 and 307–316.

with the one exception of architecture, because persons who profess it are falsely called architects in the absence of a genuine training».

Pliny 34.5: «The method of casting costly works of art in bronze has so gone out that for a long time now not even luck in this matter has had the privilege of producing art».

Pliny 34.46–7: «This statue (scil.: the bronze colossal statue of the emperor Nero by Zenodorus) has shown that skill in bronze–founding has perished, since Nero was quite ready to provide gold and silver, and also Zenodorus was counted inferior to none of the artists of old in his knowledge of modelling and chasing. (...) The greater was the eminence of Zenodorus, the more we realise how the art of working bronze has deteriorated».

Pliny 35. 2: «painting, an art that was formerly illustrious, at the time when it was in high demand with kings and nations and when it ennobled others whom it deigned to transmit to posterity. But at the present time it has been entirely ousted by marbles, and indeed finally also by gold».

Pliny 35.4: «The painting of portraits (...) has entirely gone out».

Pliny 35.5: «people tapestry the walls of their picture–galleries with old pictures (...). Indolence has destroyed the arts, and since our minds cannot be portrayed, our bodily features are also neglected».

Pliny 35.28: «thus much for the dignity of this now expiring art (scil.: painting) (*de dignitate artis morientis*)».

Pliny 35.50: «Four colours only were used by the illustrious painters Apelles, Acton, Melanthius and Nicomachus to execute their immortal works (...) although their pictures each sold for the wealth of a whole town. Nowadays (...) there is no such thing as high–class painting. Everything in fact was superior in the days when resources were scantier. The reason for this is that (...) it is the values of material and not of genius that people are now on the look–out for».¹⁹³

Not by chance, the copying of ancient works of art goes out of fashion during the fourth century A.D., a period when people begin to think that contemporary monuments are more beautiful than the ancient ones. The first written text in which this idea is expressed is in Ausonius, *Mosella*: the late Roman villas along the Mosella river seem to this poet not inferior to the Parthenon, the arsenal at the Piraeus made by Philon, the monuments of Alexandria made by Dinocharis, the altar of Pergamum, etc., both for scenographic value and for integration of art and nature.¹⁹⁴

For the reasons listed above, it does seem more likely that most of the sculptural copies, made in the Roman world during the Late Republican and Imperial times, must have derived from Classical Greek originals. If this conclusion is accepted, it is possible to gain a more pluralistic idea of Classical visual arts, characterised by the coexistence of different styles in the same time and city. This opinion is strengthened further by the observation that testimonies of ancient writers point towards the same conclusion. The styles of Euphranor, Praxiteles, Scopas and Leochares are defined by ancient writers in very different terms, but nevertheless they coexisted in Athens in the same period, i.e. in the central decades of the fourth century BC

¹⁹³ The translations reported here are *Loeb*.

¹⁹⁴ See Ausonius, *Mosella* 20–22 and 283–348, in particular 298–317. For a critical evaluation of the changing taste and aesthetical ideas of this period, see Corso (nt. 67) 31–36.

Concerning Leochares, it is possible to argue from Tatian 36 that he had interpreted the male body in an effeminate way. From Pliny 34.79, we understand that the expression of quick movements and the spectacular and theatrical impact of his figures were Leochares' speciality. From *Anthologia Graeca* 12.221 and Martial 1.7 we understand that the rendering of the atmospheric space around the figure was another his speciality.

The art of Euphranor is well epitomised by Pliny 34.128: *expressisse dignitates heroum et usurpasse symmetriam, in universitate corporum exilior et capitibus articulisque grandior*. The problems of the grandeur and the expression of dignity were thus the concerns of this master.

The art of Scopas is clearly expressed by Callistratus 2 as well as in the ecphrastic poem *Anthologia Graeca* 9.774: the expression of extreme sentiments and feelings was what distinguished Scopas.

Finally, Praxiteles had been regarded especially by Lucian, *Amores* 11–17 as the master of the female beauty and of grace.

Antonio Corso

12, Thiseos

Vari – Varkiza

Athens GR-166 72

Captions

1. Zeus Ithomatas on a coin struck by Messene, dated to the third century BC, London, British Museum.
2. Roman copies from Polycleitos' Doryphorus: left, copy from Pompei, Naples, National Archaeological Museum; right, copy at Minneapolis, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts.
3. Erechtheum Corai: left, original statue at London, British Museum; right, Roman copy of Hadrianic period from Tivoli, Villa Hadriana, Museum.
4. Paeonius' Nike, Olympia, National Archaeological Museum.
5. Agesandrus, Polydorus and Athenodorus, Laocoon, Rome, Vatican Museums.
6. Farnese Bull, Naples, National Archaeological Museum.
7. Aesquelinum Charioteer, Rome, Capitoline Museums.
8. Left, Demeter from Cnidus, London, British Museum; right, head of Alexander, Athens, Acropolis Museum.
9. Crouching Aphrodite, Roman copy from Villa Hadriana at Tivoli, Rome, National Archaeological Museum.
10. Piraeus Apollo, Piraeus, National Archaeological Museum.
11. Myron's Athena and Marsyas, reconstruction drawing by Sauer.
12. Belvedere Apollo, Rome, Vatican Museums.
13. Left, Stainhäuser head of the Belvedere type of Apollo, Basle, Antikenmuseum; right, head of Apollo from the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, London, British Museum.
14. Soranzo Eros, St. Petersburg, Ermitage.
15. Maenad, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Antikensammlung.
16. Head of Telephus, from the western pediment of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea.



Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3



Fig. 4



Fig. 5



Fig. 6



Fig. 8





Fig. 7



Fig. 9



Fig. 10



Fig. 12



Fig. 11




Fig. 13




Fig. 14



Fig. 15




Fig. 16