


EULIMENE

##plugins.generic.pdfFrontPageGenerator.front.vol## 5 (2004)

EULIMENE 5 (2004)



The Position of Portraiture in early Hellenistic Art Criticism,

Antonio Corso

doi: [10.12681/eul.32767](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.32767)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

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

Τόμος 5
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2004

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

ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ-ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ
Δρ. Νίκος Λιτίνας (Ρέθυμνο)
Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)
ΒΟΗΘΟΣ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ
Δρ. Δήμητρα Τσαγκάρη (Αθήνα)

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

PUBLISHING DIRECTORS
EDITORS-IN-CHIEF
Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)
ASSISTANT TO THE EDITORS
Dr. Dimitra Tsangari (Athens)

Η Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία και οι Εκδότες του περιοδικού
ευχαριστούν θερμά τους Roger and Polly Beecroft, York, England για την κάλυψη μέρους
του κόστους της έκδοσης.

Mediterranean Archaeological Society and the Editors wish to thank
Roger and Polly Beecroft, York, England for their contribution to the cost of the
publication.

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 (Ρόδος)
Δρ. Ιωάννης Τουράτσογλου (Αθήνα)
Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Αναγνώστης Αγγελαράκης (Adelphi)
Καθ. Σταύρος Περεντίδης (Βόλος)

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymnon)
Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymnon)
Dr. Alan W. Johnston (London)
Prof. François Lefèvre (Paris)
Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Heidelberg)
Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)
Dr. Ioannis Touratsoglou (Athens)
Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Prof. Anagnostis Agelarakis (Adelphi)
Prof. Stavros Perentidis (Volos)

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

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ περιλαμβάνει επίσης μελέτες στην Ανθρωπολογία, Παλαιοδημογραφία, Παλαιοπεριβάλλον, Παλαιοβιοτανολογία, 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 οχέδια γίνονται με μαύρο μελάνι σε καλής ποιότητας χαρτί με ξεκάθαρους χαρακτήρες, ώστε να επιδέχονται ορικρυνοντ. Οι φωτογραφίες είναι ασπρόμαυρες, τυπωμένες σε γναλιστερό χαρτί. Όλα τα εικονογραφικά στοιχεία είναι αριθμημένα σε αιπλή 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 ανάτυπα και έναν τόμο του περιοδικού. Επιπλέον ανάτυπα 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. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης, Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου, Τμήμα Μεσογειακών Σπουδών, Ρόδος – GR 85100

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, palaio-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, Rethymnon – GR 74100

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

Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis, University of the Aegean, Department of Mediterranean Studies, Rhodes – GR 85100

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

mail: eulimene@mail.com

Περιεχόμενα
ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 5 (2004)

List of contents
EULIMENE 5 (2004)

Περιλήψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti	7
Antonio Corso, The position of portraiture in early Hellenistic art criticism	11
Γιάννος Κουράγιος, Δεσποτικό: Ένα νέο ιερό σε μία ακατοίκητη νησίδα των Κυκλαδων	27
Σταυρούλα Οικονόμου, Νεκρικά κοσμήματα: Τα ελάσματα κάλυψης του στόματος	91
Sophia Kremydi-Sicilianou, Patterns of monetary circulation in Roman Macedonia: The hoard evidence	135
Fragkiska Megaloudi, Agriculture in mainland Greece at the Protogeometric period: A view from the archaeobotanical remains	151

Περιλήψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti

Antonio Corso, The Position of Portraiture in early Hellenistic Art Criticism, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 5 (2004), 11-25

La posizione del ritratto nella critica d'arte del primo ellenismo. L'autore cerca di delineare quale sia stato lo svolgimento della ritrattistica delineato dai critici d'arte del primo ellenismo e in particolare da Senocrate di Atene, un allievo della scuola sicionia attivo nei decenni centrali del III sec. a.C. Notizie desunte dai due trattati di Senocrate sulla bronzistica e sulla pittura sembrano infatti esser confluite nella trattazione sulle arti antiche di Plinio il Vecchio cosiccome in altre opere letterarie di eta' ellenistica o romana imperiale. L'inizio dell'arte di rappresentare un individuo in particolare sarebbe stato attribuito a Butade di Sacione, che avrebbe fatto un primo ritratto coroplastico del fidanzato della figlia. Meno certa è invece l'eventualità che Senocrate avesse incluso nella sua sequenza storica le immagini iconiche di Cleobi e Bitone, erette a Delfi e replicate ad Argo, ad opera di scultori argivi. Invece, la caricatura di Ipponatte ad opera di Bupalo e Atenide e l'autoritratto di Teodoro di Samo dovevano aver costituito momenti salienti nella dinamica storica ricostruita da Senocrate. Altri momenti importanti della medesima ricostruzione sembrano esser state statue di Olimpionici, il gruppo di Armodio e Aristogitone di Antenore e le raffigurazioni dei generali Greci e Persiani nella battaglia di Maratona dipinta nella *Stoa Poikile*. L'età di Pericle potrebbe aver costituito –nella teoria senocratea– una battuta d'arresto nel processo di affermazione del ritratto realistico. La compiuta espressione del ritratto fisiognomico sarebbe stata attribuita a Demetrio di Alopeke. Infine, il culmine di quest' arte sarebbe stato posto nell'età di Alessandro e dei primi diadoci e sarebbe stato segnato dalle personalità di Lisippo, Lisistrato, Apelle e Protogene.

Γιάννος Κουράγιος, Δεσποτικό: 'Ἐνα νέο ιερό σε μια ακατοίκητη νησίδα των Κυκλαδών, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 5 (2004), 27-89

Despotiko: a newly discovered sanctuary at an uninhabited isle of the Cyclades. Despotiko lies to the west of Paros and Antiparos, in a strategic position, in the centre of Cyclades. The site of Mandra is located at the island's north-east corner. The island has been identified with ancient Prepesinthus, mentioned by Strabo and Pliny. The archaeological remains of Despotiko were first explored in the late nineteenth century by Ch. Tsountas, who excavated early Cycladic cemeteries at Livadi and Zoumbaria and identified remains of a prehistoric settlement at the site Chiromilos. Rescue excavations were initiated in 1997 under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture. Short annual campaigns of excavation continued through 2000, focused on the site at Mandra, where a large sanctuary dedicated to Apollo has been located. Up to date eight large buildings have been found. Apart from the Archaic building of the sixth century BC, Classical and Hellenistic buildings have been unearthed. Although the temple has not been located yet, many parts of the temple's upper structure, built in later walls, have been identified. The

excavation has yielded a great number of finds, many of which are of prime importance as to the interpretation of the site, its role in the Aegean and its relations with the Near East, from the Archaic to the Roman period.

Σταυρούλα Οικονόμου, Νεκρικά κοσμήματα: Τα ελάσματα κάλυψης του στόματος, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 5 (2004), 91-133

Burial jewels: the custom of mouth bands. Mouth bands made of gold, or rarely of silver, appear in different types of burials mostly in the area of the south Balkans as early as the Neolithic period until the early Christian era. The custom seems to apply especially to regions under direct or indirect Mycenaean influence, such as Cyprus of the Late Bronze Age and Macedonia of the archaic and classical periods. Some of these bands are decorated with floral, geometrical or pictorial patterns whereas others bare no decoration.

The few inscribed gold bands, usually in the shape of a leaf, mention either the name of the deceased or a dedication to the underworld deities and date from the fourth c. B.C. to the first c. A.D. These are associated to the gold «dionysiac-orphic» sheets and to the mystery cults of Dionysus and Persephone.

Sophia Kremydi-Sicilianou, Patterns of monetary circulation in Roman Macedonia: The hoard evidence, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 5 (2004), 135-149

Νομισματική κυκλοφορία στη Ρωμαϊκή Μακεδονία: Η μαρτυρία των θησαυρών. Στο άρθρο αυτό παρουσιάζονται οι «θησαυροί» που έχουν βρεθεί στην περιοχή της Μακεδονίας κατά τους ρωμαϊκούς χρόνους με ιδιαίτερη έμφαση στα πρόσφατα ευρήματα. Συζητείται η διάδοση του ρωμαϊκού νομίσματος στην περιοχή και αντιδιαστέλλεται η σχετικά συχνή εμφάνιση των αργυρών υποδιαιρέσεων, κυρίως των δηναρίων, με την εξαιρετικά σπάνια εμφάνιση των χαλκών και την πλήρη απουσία των χρυσών.

Οι «θησαυροί» που περιέχουν χάλκινες κοπές των επαρχιακών νομισματοκοπείων ταξινομούνται σε τέσσερεις γεωγραφικές ενότητες που αντιστοιχούν στις τέσσερεις μεριδες. Τα συμπεράσματα που προκύπτουν από το υλικό είναι τα ακόλουθα: Η συντριπτική πλειονότητα των χάλκινων κοπών που κυκλοφορούσαν στη περιοχή ανήκαν στα μακεδονικά νομισματοκοπεία ενώ, εντελώς εξαιρετικά, εμφανίζονται νομίσματα από τη Μικρά Ασία. Επιπλέον, παρόλο που οι «θησαυροί» του πρώτου αιώνα είναι ελάχιστοι, φαίνεται πως την περίοδο αυτή τα νομίσματα δεν απομακρύνονταν σχεδόν καθόλου από την περιοχή που κόπηκαν. Κατά τον δεύτερο αλλά κυρίως κατά τον τρίτο αιώνα, οι επαρχιακές κοπές κυκλοφορούσαν ευρύτερα μέσα στη Μακεδονία: οι κοπές της πρώτης μεριδας ωστόσο εξακολουθούσαν να μετακινούνται λιγότερο, τουλάχιστον προς δυσμάς. Η ευρύτερη κυκλοφορία των νομισμάτων του τρίτου αιώνα θα πρέπει να συνδέεται με την παρατηρημένη μετρολογική αλλά και τεχνοτροπική τους ομοιομορφία.

Τέλος προτείνεται πως, αντίθετα με ότι συνέβαινε σε παλαιότερες περιόδους, οι κοπές των επαρχιακών πόλεων στους αυτοκρατορικούς χρόνους μπορούσαν να γίνουν αμοιβαία αποδεκτές ως νόμιμο μέσο συναλλαγής από γειτονικές πόλεις. Εάν η υπόθεση είναι ορθή, τότε η πρακτική αυτή αποτελεί ένα πρώτο βήμα προς την κατεύθυνση της

νομισματικής ενοποίησης της αυτοκρατορίας που επεβλήθη με τις μεταρρυθμίσεις του Διοκλητιανού.

Fragkiska Megaloudi, Agriculture in mainland Greece at the Protogeometric period: A view from the archaeobotanical remains, ΕΥΑΙΜΕΝΗ 5 (2004), 151-160

Agriculture et alimentation en Grèce Proto-géométrique: les restes carpologiques. La présente étude réalise la première synthèse des données archéo-botaniques disponibles en Grèce concernant la période proto-géométrique. Cinq sites situés dans la partie continentale de la Grèce et datés de la première phase de la période proto-géométrique ont été analysés de manière descriptive. Leur étude a permis d'attester la présence de céréales (orge, engrain, amidonnier, froment, épeautre, millet), de légumes (lentilles, pois, gesses, fèves, ers), d'oléagineux (pavot, cameline, lin) et d'espèces fruitières (figue, vigne).

THE POSITION OF PORTRAITURE IN EARLY HELLENISTIC ART CRITICISM

A well known rhetorical pattern within ancient art criticism is the interpretation of the visual arts in biological terms.¹ For the early critics, each art had a discovery, a development, a peak, a decadence and a death. This model seems to have been first elaborated within the Aristotelean school and to have been applied to the visual arts by Xenocrates. This phenomenon has already been carefully documented by Bernhard Schweitzer.² The precise manner in which the early Hellenistic critics applied this pattern to the development of portraiture is the subject of this paper.

Xenocrates was active ca. 280-230 BC. He received an Aristotelean education and was himself a bronze sculptor, trained in the school of Sicyon.³ According to Pliny the Elder (*NH* 1. 33-4; 34. 83; 35. 68), Xenocrates wrote books *de toreatice* and *de pictura*.⁴ While his treatises do not survive, they do seem to have been heavily utilized by Pliny the Elder for his encyclopedia on the visual arts, in particular books 34, 35 and 36 of his *Naturalis Historia*.⁵ Antigonus of Caristus also wrote during the last half of the third century BC; his books were also entitled *de toreatice* and *de pictura*.⁶ Since Pliny associates Antigonus specifically with Xenocrates in reference to identical interpretations of the visual arts,⁷ it seems likely that Antigonus followed Xenocrates' biological interpretation of the evolution of sculpture and painting, albeit with minor alterations. Later authors preserve this third century tradition, although Pliny, of course, is foremost among them.

¹ A previous version of this article has been presented as a paper in the congress on early Hellenistic portraiture held in the German Institute of Athens, in November, 2002. I wish to thank Prof. Andrew Stewart and Dr. Von den Hoff, for their contribution to the discussion which followed my paper. On the interpretation of visual arts in biological terms, Pollitt 1974, 37-41 and 73-81; Isager 1991, 97-103 and 125-31; Settis 1993, 469-98.

² Schweitzer 1932, 11-19 and 32-52. On Aristotle's biological model, Warry 1962, 83-148; Waterflow 1982, 1-261; Charles 1997, 27-42; King 2001, 1-16; Lennox 2001, 229-58.

³ Neudecker 2002, 623 and Lehmann 2004, 521-2. The Aristotelean education of Xenocrates is argued from these two considerations: a. Xenocrates had been a pupil of Eutocrates (Pliny 34.83), a son of Lysippus, who had been closely linked with Aristotle (Moreno 1995, 18-9 and 26-8); b. Xenocrates' biological interpretation of the evolution of sculpture and painting derives from the Peripatetic biological model (cf. n. 2).

⁴ See also Diogenes Laertius 4.18.

⁵ See especially Schweitzer 1932; Ferri 1946, 11-27; Moreno 1966, 1234; Pollitt 1974, 73-81; Corso 1988 a, 104-9; 289-91 and 512-5; Isager 1991, 13; 102; 128; and 148; Settis 1993, 469-98 and Neudecker 2002, 623.

⁶ See Pliny 1.33-4; 34.84 and 35.68; Diogenes Laertius 2.15; 7.187-8; 9.49; Zenobius 5.82. On the art criticism of Antigonus of Carystus, see Dorandi 1999, lxxxiii-cxxiii; 35-37, *testimonia* nos. 42-9.

⁷ Xenocrates and Antigonus are associated by Pliny in 1.33-4; 34.83-4 and 35.68. For a general bibliography on these early art historians, cf. notes 1 and 2. Pliny outlines a biological interpretation of bronze sculpture and painting in 34.49-71 and 35.53-111 respectively.

These later sources allow us to reconstruct the evolution of ancient Greek portraiture as it was conceptualized and systematized by the early Hellenistic art critics. They also allow us to differentiate the various rhetorical phases that were developed by these early art historians and to understand how these phases were used to explain the development of this important genre.

Archaeologically, the early Hellenistic period was marked by a great boom in portraiture, both in sculpture and in painting. It is not surprising that art critics of this period became deeply concerned with portraiture in their treatises.⁸ Following the Peripatetic model, the development of portraiture as outlined by the early Hellenistic critics was broken into distinct phases. The phases which we can recover correspond to the discovery, development and peak phases of the genre. What makes the specific use of this model particularly interesting, however, is that these phases of the development of the genre are consistently constructed in terms of likeness and realism. In the early literature, the development of the genre across the centuries was cast in terms that were of particular aesthetic concern in the early Hellenistic period. Likeness and realism, in other words, formed the conceptual axis on which the development of the genre was plotted by the art historians of the early Hellenistic age.⁹

The first step in this development was, of course, the *inventio*, or *heuresis*, of the genre — the initial conceptualization of the possibility that a person could be represented in the arts. According to an anecdote reported by Pliny (35.151) and Athenagoras (*Legatio pro Christianis* 14: around AD 176), the daughter of the Sicyonian clay maker Boutades (who lived in Corinth before the middle of seventh century) sketched the outline of her boyfriend's shadow that had been cast on the wall by lamplight as he slept. Delighted with the perfection of the likeness, Boutades cut out the shape, filled in the outline with clay and made a model that he dried and baked.¹⁰ The reproduction of a person's individual features thus found its first expression in the rendering of its outline. For Pliny (35.151): «*It was through the service of that same earth that modelling portraits from clay was first invented by Butades, a potter of Sicyon, at Corinth. He did this owing to his daughter, who was in love with a young man; and she, when he was going abroad, drew in outline on the wall the shadow of his face thrown by a lamp. Her father pressed clay on this and made a relief, which he hardened by exposure to fire with the rest of his pottery; and it is said that this likeness was preserved in the Nymphaeum until the destruction of Corinth by Mummius.*»¹¹

Athenagoras (*Legatio pro Christianis* 14) gives a slightly more elaborate version of the same story: «*Images (eikones) (...) were not in honour at all before the arts of modelling (plastike), of painting (graphike) and of statuary of human subjects (andriantopoietikē) were introduced, but are later than the days of Saurias of Samos, Kraton of Sikyon, Kleanthes of Corinth and a maiden, also of Corinth. Linear drawing (skiagraphia) was discovered by Saurias, who traced the outline (perigrapho) of the shadow cast by a horse in the sun, and painting (graphike) by Kraton, who painted on a whitened tablet (pinax leleukomenos), the shadows (skiai) of a man and woman. The maiden invented the art of modelling figures in relief (koroplastike). She was in love with a youth,*

⁸ Painted portraits: Nowicka 1993, 19-32 and 63-128. Sculpted portraits: Fittschen 1988, 61-9; 78-111; 116; 141-223; 267-85; 374-6 and Von den Hoff 1994.

⁹ On the prevalence of realistic concerns in the early Hellenistic art, Andreae 1998.

¹⁰ See Müller 2001a, 126.

¹¹ Translation by Rackham 1952, 371-3 with an amendment.

and while he lay asleep she sketched the outline of his shadow (skia) on the wall. Delighted with the perfection of the likeness, her father, who was a potter, cut out the shape (anaglypho) and filled in the outline (perigraphe) with clay; the figure is still preserved at Corinth.»¹²

Of course, the particular care in the rendering outlines was typical of Corinthian makers of terracottas in the seventh century BC (fig. 1).¹³ This may have contributed to the early idea that portraiture was invented in this way and within this Corinthian context. More importantly, it is very likely that this story can be traced to the early Hellenistic period and to Xenocrates. It is equally clear that what distinguished the invention of a *portrait* from, say, the invention of painting generally, was the discovery that a likeness could be shaped with human hands. The specification that the *heuretes* had been a Sicyonian, even if he lived at Corinth, also strongly hints at the bias of a critic educated in the Sicyonian school.¹⁴ The concern with the *heuretes* also corresponds with the biological interpretation of the visual arts typical of the peripatetic school that was so influential for Pliny's interpretation of visual arts. There is only one art critic who was both a champion of the Sicyonian school, educated in the Peripatetic tradition and who was admittedly followed by Pliny in his interpretation of visual arts, Xenocrates. Indeed, the interpretation of this *heuresis* not as a creation, but as a chance discovery agrees perfectly with the interpretation of visual arts as primarily natural in scope, an idea the roots of which are blatantly Aristotelean (on the concept of *heuresis* as determined by chance, cf. Aristotle, *Ars poetica* 4.3; 5.7; 9.6; 14.7; *Ethica Nicomachea* 6.4). The derivation of this story of *heuresis* from Xenocrates is nearly certain.

The second phase of the evolution of portraiture –its development– was constructed in the early literature as taking place over the sixth, fifth and early fourth centuries. Herodotus (1.31.5) notes that the Argives made *eikones* of Cleobis and Biton, at Delphi first of all, in the age of Solon. Pausanias (2.20.3) and Pollux (7.61) record that the Argives then set up statues of the two brothers also at Argos. While it is unlikely that the so-called Cleobis and Biton discovered at Delphi (fig. 2) are the statues mentioned by Herodotus (since they seem to represent rather the Dioscuri) it is possible that the Cleobis and Biton represented on coins of Argus (fig. 3) show the style of the Argive dedication and that this dedication was inspired by the dedication at Delphi.¹⁵ A Roman relief (fig. 4) keeps the general iconography of the episode evoked on the coins but the style of the figures, especially of the mother, is much changed.¹⁶ The specificity of the portraits, in this case, may have been obtained through somatic individualization –the representation of the body performing an action specific to that person. There is little good evidence that Xenocrates ever discussed these Argive dedications. Even so, we must not forget the fame of these *eikones* at Delphi, having been evoked by Herodotus. It also seems unlikely that Pausanias would have ignored the early Hellenistic critics in his

¹² Translation by K. Jex-Blake, in Jex-Blake and Sellers 1896, 224-7.

¹³ See Jenkins 1940, 101-4 and 191-255; Newhall Stillwell 1952, 25-7; 32-6; 43-4; 47-8; 50-2; 55-83; 164-6; 171-4; 179-82; 184-5; 188-92; 195-211; Pemberton 1989, 178-83; Rolley 1994, 140-2.

¹⁴ This deduction has been stressed in Corso 1988 a, 473, n. 1-2 to Pliny 35. 151.

¹⁵ Identification: the inscribed name *Polydeukes* can be seen on the left thigh of the so-called Cleobis on the photos printed in Vatin 1982, 509-25, figs. 2 and 3. For the images generally, see Kreikenbom 2002, 133-69, particularly 143-7 and Vollkommer 2004, 296. Argive coins: Arias 1986, nos. 8-9.

¹⁶ See Arias 1986, 119, no. 5.

choice of the monuments to be considered. It is also significant that Xenocrates seems to have given special emphasis to the schools of Argos and Sicyon.¹⁷ It would have been very odd indeed had he forgotten these important Argive monuments. That the images were stone, and not specifically the subject of the Xenocrates' two works should not overly concern us. Indeed, their material might account for their omission. On the other hand, Xenocrates may have treated the images since it is certain that Antigonus treated exceptionally important stone sculptures, such as the Nemesis of Rhamnous in one of his two books on the visual arts.¹⁸ It is also important to keep in mind that the titles of ancient books often referred to just one part of the subject treated in them. The most obvious example is the *Anabasis* by Xenophon a title which, of course, applied only to the first book of the work.

The development of portraiture for the early Hellenistic critics continues with the caricature of Hipponax painted by Bupalus and Athenis during the Panathenaic festivals of ca. 540 BC.¹⁹ The account is handed down by Acron (a *scholium* to Horace, *Epodi* 6.14),²⁰ Ovid (*Ibis* 523)²¹ and Suidas.²² It is most carefully recorded by Pliny (36.11-12): «*There had already lived in the island of Chios a sculptor Melas, who was succeeded by his son Micciades and his grandson Archermus; and the sons of Archermus named Bupalus and Athenis, were quite the most eminent masters of the art at the time of the poet Hipponax, who is known to have been alive in the 60th Olympiad (540-37 BC). (...). Hipponax had a notoriously ugly face; and because of this they made impudent jokes much to the amusement of the groups of companions to whom they exhibited his likeness. This angered Hipponax, who rebuked them so violently in his mordant lampoons that he is believed by some to have driven them to hang themselves».²³*

The importance of this anecdote cannot be overstated. Indeed, it is consistently repeated throughout the literary tradition that the particular (in this case ugly) features of the face of this particular sitter found expression in painting in Ionia by masters of the Chian school. Clearly, the early Hellenistic critics believed that the development belonged to early island masters. More importantly they believed that the development of the genre had to be sketched in these terms, as a consistent move towards the realistic depiction of a face. In the third century, the fact that Hipponax's likeness could be represented is what made the painting a portrait. The presence of this notice in Pliny's passage devoted to these Chian masters and the fact that it is included in the context of the outline of the evolution of the visual arts from its beginning –a formal criteria which reveals a Peripatetic and early Hellenistic approach to the *videndae artes*– suggest that this episode featured strongly in the early Hellenistic criticism of art.

¹⁷ See Schweitzer 1932. Pausanias acknowledges his early Hellenistic antiquarian sources in 1.9.8; 12.2; 13.8-9; 34.4; 2.12.6; 19.5; 21.6; 22.2 and 7; 23.8; 34.4; 4.1.6-8; 6.1-4; 15.2; 17.2; 35.4; 6.6.3; 7.6-7; 18.6; 7.17.9; 18.1; 8.12.1; 30.8-9; 37.2; 52.6-53.1; 9.5.8; 29.1-2; 35.5; 38.9-10; 10.4.6-7; 12.8; 15.2-3; 5-6; 21.5; 26.8; 38.13. Cf. Bearzot 1992.

¹⁸ Zenobius 5. 82 reports that Antigonus of Carystus wrote on the marble statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous.

¹⁹ See Broeker 2001 a, 104-5 and Müller 2001 b, 125-6.

²⁰ For the cited passage of Acron, the edition followed is Keller 1902, 404-5.

²¹ For the cited passage of Ovid, the edition followed is La Penna 1957, 129-30.

²² Cf. Suidas, *s. v. Hipponax*.

²³ Translation by Eichholz 1962, 9-11.

Also belonging to this phase of development, Pliny (34.83) records that Theodorus of Samos (575-525 BC) made the first self portrait, in bronze, remarkable for its *similitudo*. Pliny 34. 83: «*Theodorus, who constructed the Labyrinth at Samos, cast a statue of himself in bronze. Besides its remarkable celebrity as a likeness, it is famous for its very minute workmanship; the right hand holds a file, and three fingers of the left hand originally held a little model of a chariot and four, but this has been taken away to Palestrina as a marvel of smallness: if the team were reproduced in a picture with the chariot and the charioteer, the model of a fly, which was made by the artist at the same time, would cover it with its wings*».²⁴

Here Pliny's testimony is certainly based on early Hellenistic sources. Theodorus's miniature quadriga already had been evoked in the third century by Posidippus in an epigram:²⁵

«(... ...) of the chariot, observe at close quarters
how hard Theodorus' hand has worked.
For you will see the yoke-band, the reins, the ring on the bit of the horses,
the axle, as well as the (driver's) eye and the tip of his fingers.
And you will see full well (the pole, as thin as a hair), and sitting on it
you might see a fly (of the size of the chariot)».²⁶

Once the urge to reproduce detailed features had been introduced into painting, it is little surprise that the early Hellenistic critics would ensure that this innovation became a concern in sculpture as well.²⁷ Theodorus's self portrait was almost certainly considered by Xenocrates, both because of the importance of this Samian artist in the field of bronze-sculpture, to which Xenocrates had devoted a specific book, and because the epigram by Posidippus proves beyond any doubt that Theodorus's art had been considered in the context of the early Hellenistic art criticism. Indeed, it should not be forgotten that Posidippus and Xenocrates were contemporaries and that they shared a similar concept of evolution of bronze sculpture, based on experiences within the schools of Argos and Sicyon.²⁸ And again it is the realistic, accurate likeness that defines the portrait's status as such as well as its greatness, even though it was made in the sixth century.

Also relevant in early Hellenistic constructions of the development of the genre were the portraits of athletes at the Panhellenic games, especially at Olympia. For Pliny (34.16): «*It was not customary to make effigies of human beings unless they deserved lasting commemoration for some distinguished reason, in the first case victory in the sacred contests and particularly those at Olympia, where it was the custom to dedicate statues of all who had won a competition; these statues, in the case of those who had been victorious there three times, 'were modelled as exact personal likenesses of the winners –what are called iconiae, portrait statues'*».²⁹

²⁴ Translation by Rackham 1952, 189. On Theodorus, Ebbinghaus 2004, 445-7.

²⁵ See Posidippus, *Epigrammata* 67 Austin and Bastianini.

²⁶ Translation by Austin: see Austin and Bastianini 2002, 91.

²⁷ The construction of this phase may have been inspired by some representations of korai which bore very particular features. The most clear case of a peculiar face is the famous statue of Phrasidlia (fig. 5). See Karanastassis 2002, 171-222, in particular 189-97; and Karakasi 2001, 115-41, pls. 235-48.

²⁸ This concept of evolution of bronze sculpture is clearly asserted by Posidippus, *Epigrammata* 62 Austin and Bastianini. Cf. Angio 2004, 65-71.

²⁹ Translation by Rackham 1952, 139.

Of course, it is difficult to state with certainty which statues Pliny describes. It cannot be ruled out, however –especially considering other remarks regarding the portraits of Hipponax (ca. 540) and Theodorus of Samos (ca. 550)– that the art historian, or more likely his source, presented the invention of these exact personal likenesses as a sixth century phenomenon. Statues of late seventh³⁰ and sixth century winners³¹ are, of course, pointed out by Pausanias (6.15.8; 6.18.7 and 8.40.1). It seems equally clear that the reproduction of an individual's body, for Pliny and hence for the early Hellenistic critics, also entailed a certain amount of somatic individualization, as Rausa has noted.³² It is not impossible that Xenocrates, so keen to concentrate his regards to the Peloponnesian school of bronze sculpture, gave full consideration to such developments of athletic sculpture.

The occasion of the first public dedication of statues of specific persons at Athens, the group of Harmodius and Aristogeiton by Antenor, also received emphasis in the early Hellenistic art historical tradition handed down by Pliny.³³ These images also stand firmly on the road to fully realistic portraiture as constructed by the third century critics. Pliny (34.17) states that: «*I rather believe that the first portrait statues officially erected at Athens were those of the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton. This happened in the same year as that in which the kings were also driven out at Rome (509 BC)*».³⁴

Since there can be little question that these famous images duplicated specific, individualizing actions of the sitters, since the replacement statues set up in 477/6 BC strove for some sort of physiognomic individuality and since these images were widely spread as Roman copies (as the Baiae casts make clear) it is not surprising why Pliny and his sources considered them portraits.

Moving into the fifth century, it is clear that the obsession with realism on the part of the early Hellenistic critics continued. When Pliny (35.57) describes the realistically reproduced commanders on both sides of the Battle of Marathon in the Stoa Poikile in Athens (painted by Micon, Panaenus, and Polygnotus) (fig. 6) he calls them *iconici duces*.³⁵ It is the realistic likeness that defines the images as portraits: «*Indeed the brother of Phidias Panaenus even painted the Battle of Marathon between the Athenians and Persians; so widely established had the employment of colour now become and such perfection of art had been attained that he is said to have introduced actual portraits of the generals who commanded in that battle, Miltiades, Callimachus and Cynaegirus on the Athenian side and Datis and Artaphernes on that of the barbarians*»³⁶. (Incidentally, this phase in the early Hellenistic construction of the

³⁰ See the statue of Eutelidas, who won in 628 BC (Pausanias 6.15.8).

³¹ See the statues of Arrhachion, winner in 564 (Pausanias 8.40.1-2), of Praxidamas, who won in 544 BC and finally of Rexibius, winner in 536 BC (Pausanias 6.18.7).

³² See Rausa 1994, 14-29 and 77-83.

³³ See Müller 2001c, 48-9, with previous selective bibliography.

³⁴ Translation by Rackham 1952, 139.

³⁵ See Demosthenes 59 (*Contra Neaeram*) 94; Lycurgus, *De sacerdotissa*, frg. 3 Conomis; Aeschines, *Contra Ctesiphontem* 186; Nepos, *Miltiades* 6.3; Persius 3.52-4; Pliny 35.57; Lucian, *Juppiter tragoedus* 32; Pausanias 1.15.3-4; Aelian, *De natura animalium* 7.38. Other sources may be found in A. Reinach, *Recueil Milliet*, Paris (1921) 136-9, no. 116; 156-65, nos. 141-55; and 168-9, no. 164. On this painting, see the old, but still important, publication by Robert 1895, 1-45; Moreno 1987, 49-70; Rouveret 1989, 152-5; Hoesch 2000a, 162-3; 2000b, 225; 2001a, 58-9 and Ehrhardt 2004, 82-4 and 180-1.

³⁶ Translation by Rackham 1952, 303-5. The concept that generals could be recognized without

development of portraiture coincides chronologically with the years of the Ostia type of Themistocles which also evidences singular features³⁷⁾ (fig. 7). In any case, no doubt can be raised regarding the presence of this important moment in the history of portraiture in Xenocrates' book on painting. The consideration of this Battle of Marathon by Pliny is a necessary moment in the evolution of painting, whose most important points –the beginning of painting at Corinth and the peak with the Sicyonian school with Apelles– reveal a clear derivation from Xenocrates' theory, as already stressed by Schweitzer.³⁸

The Hellenistic critics regarded the high Classical period as a moment of idealization of portraits. This on account of Pliny's critical evaluation of the art of Cresilas, the master of the portrait of Pericles (34.74): «*nobiles viros nobiliores fecit*» (he added celebrity to men already celebrated). Indeed, Pericles' portrait (fig. 8) reveals the marked idealization of the features of this statesman.³⁹ Again, Pliny's remark is included in a section devoted to bronze sculpture which, again, is interpreted as a constant biological progress that culminates in the Sicyonian Lysippus. This, in turn, has provoked the idea that the remark should derive from an early Hellenistic and Sicyonian art critic. This art critic should be nobody but Xenocrates.

It must also be noted, however, that realism continued to play a dominant role in the mind of the early Hellenistic art writers, even when discussing the portraits at the height of the Classical age. Indeed, the gossip concerning Phidias' portrait of himself and of Pericles in the Amazonomachy on the shield of the Athena Parthenos⁴⁰ (fig. 9) reveals that, in the opinion of the Hellenistic critics, this idealistic trend was not regarded as completely prevalent in the period.⁴¹ The presence of this anecdote in Peripatetic sources such as the *De mundo* (399 b) and the *Mirabilia* (155) attributed to Aristotle suggests that it was taken in consideration by the Xenocratic tradition that was the closest to the Peripatetic school.

The early Hellenistic obsession with realism seems to have reached a crisis in the discussion of Demetrius of Alopeke. According to Quintilian (12.10.9) Demetrius was criticized «*for carrying realism too far*», for he was more concerned with likeness than with beauty. Similar remarks are preserved in Lucian (*Philopseudes* 19-20) and Pliny the Younger (*Epistulae* 3.6).⁴² The development of visual arts outlined by Quintilian is very similar to that outlined by Pliny. Both are thought to depend on the same art historical

inscriptions is handed down also by Aeschines and Nepos, cited above, note 35.

³⁷ See Rolley 1994, 392-6 (the so-called Epinomis type of Homer may also be attributed to this realistic trend in portraiture) and Despinis 2001, 103-27.

³⁸ See Schweitzer 1932 and Isager 1991, 97-103 and 125-31.

³⁹ See Corso 2002, 91-112. The translation of Pliny's passage on Cresilas is by Rackham 1952, 183. Cresilas' peak has been dated by myself (cf. Corso 2002, 94, note 17: «between the last years of Pericles and the period of the Sicilian expedition»). Keesling 2004, 79-91, rather unfairly, does not acknowledge my contribution toward a late 5th century date of this sculptor.

⁴⁰ For the shield: Rolley 1999, 61-3 and Strocka 2004, 210-36, with previous selective bibliography.

⁴¹ For the gossip: Aristotle, *De mundo* (399b) and *Mirabilia* (155). See also Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes* (1.15.34) and *De oratore* (2.17.73); Valerius Maximus (8.14.6); Dio Chrysostomus, *Orationes* (12.6.373.228); Plutarch, *Pericles* (31); Apuleius, *De mundo* (32); Ampelius, *Liber memorialis* (8).

⁴² The translation of Quintilian's passage is by Russell 2001, 287. On Demetrius, see Müller 2001d, 163-4. The style attributed by Quintilian to Demetrius, incidentally, is quite in line with that of the Porticello portrait (fig. 10) (see, for example, Lattanzi, *s.d.*, 178-9).

tradition. It is likely that the judgment on Demetrius handed down by Quintilian goes back to the art criticism of Xenocrates and Antigonus.⁴³ The early Hellenistic critics would never have missed this opportunity to comment on this artist marking as he does the eventual entrance of what we might call physiognomic portraiture in the visual arts.

In describing the Late Classical period, early Hellenistic critics continue to focus on the genre of realistic portraiture as the dominant current in the visual arts. Alexander's decision to give Lysippus and Apelles the privilege to portray him (fig. 11) is repeated by a long tradition.⁴⁴ According to Pliny⁴⁵ «*Apelles' portraits were (...) perfect likeness*».⁴⁶ Moreover, Lysippus' younger brother, Lysistratus was, according to Pliny⁴⁷ «*the first who obtained portraits by making a plaster mould on the actual features (...). He also first rendered likeness with exactitude*».⁴⁸ Pliny (35.103) also notes, regarding the early Hellenistic painter Protogenes, that «*he aimed at absolute truth (verum) in his painting and not at a simple likeness (verisimile)*».⁴⁹

It is virtually certain that Xenocrates, having been a student of Euthycrates, son of Lysippus⁵⁰ and also of Tisocrates, a student of Euthycrates,⁵¹ was responsible for the thesis that the peak of bronze sculpture and painting should be placed in the age of Alexander and that it should fall on Lysippus and Apelles respectively. It is this idea that is handed down by Pliny and Quintilian.⁵² It seems equally certain that the obsession with likeness or realism seen throughout Pliny's description of the development of the genre should also be attributed to the early Hellenistic art historians.

It is not by chance that the peak of these arts corresponds to the peak of realism in the history of sculpture and painting.⁵³ Realistic portraiture was, for the early Hellenistic critics, one of the fundamental components of the arts whose aim was to reproduce visual experience (Pliny 34.65).⁵⁴ For this reason, the early Hellenistic history of portraiture reads as a history of realism –it was upon these very particular early Hellenistic criteria that all other periods were judged.

⁴³ Concerning the dependance of both Pliny and Quintilian from the art historical tradition of Xenocrates, see Corso 1988b, 115-6, source no. 44 and comment on it and Lehmann 2004, 521.

⁴⁴ See Cicero, *Ad familiares* 5.12.6-7; Horace, *Epistulae* 2.1.232-44; Valerius Maximus 8.11. ext. 2; Pliny 7.125; 35.85 and 37.8; Plutarch, *De Alexandri fortuna aut virtute* 2.2-3; *De Iside et Osiride* 24d; *Alexander* 4.1; Arrian, *Alexandri anabasis* 1.164-5; Apuleius, *Florida* 7; Himerius, *Meletai kai logoi* 31.5; Scholiast to Horace, *Epistulae* 2.1.239-40; Choricius, *Dialaxeis* 34.1-3. On the portraits of Alexander made by Lysippus and Apelles, see Stewart 1993, 9-70; 106-13; 191-209; 360-2. On Lysippus, see Moreno 2004, 27-39.

⁴⁵ See Pliny 35.88.

⁴⁶ Translation by K. Jex-Blake in Jex-Blake and Sellers 1896, 124-5. On Apelles, see Moreno 2000, 11-130 and Broeker 2001b, 62-4.

⁴⁷ See Pliny 35.153.

⁴⁸ Translation by K. Jex-Blake in Jex-Blake and Sellers 1896, 176-7. On Lysistratus, see Neudecker 1999, 612 and Schollmeyer 2004, 40.

⁴⁹ Translation by J. Jex-Blake, in Jex-Blake and Sellers 1896, 138-9, with an amendment. On Protogenes, see Höesch 2001a, 463-4 and Ehrhardt 2004, 323-4.

⁵⁰ See note 3, above.

⁵¹ On Tisocrates, Andreae 2004, 437.

⁵² See bibliography cited in n. 1 and 2.

⁵³ On realism in the early Hellenistic period see Andreae 1998, 19-276.

⁵⁴ See Moreno 1995, 18-25.

Unfortunately, there are no certain or even probable traces of the ideas of Xenocrates or Antigonus in the visual arts during the period after the age of Alexander and the first diadochi. The decline required by the early Hellenistic biological model –the decadence and death– is therefore lost.

There seems little evidence to support the idea that the *cessavit ars* of Pliny 34.51, the idea that bronze sculpture did not flourish after 296-3, can be traced to the theories of Xenocrates and Antigonus since we can argue now from the recovered epigrams of Posidippus that the idea that the early Hellenistic period as an age of decadence in visual culture was not yet rooted in the contemporary thought.⁵⁵ Indeed, this opinion should probably belong to the Neo-Classicalists and may have been codified in *Chronicles* of Apollodorus of Athens, soon after the middle of the 2nd century BC.⁵⁶ This Neo-Attic prejudice against early Hellenistic styles, realism in particular, was destined to be accepted until the beginning of the twentieth century.⁵⁷

Interestingly enough, Pliny's interest in likeness and realism also diminishes after this time. It is possible that Xenocrates did not continue his history into the first decades of the third century B C and that he closed his treatise with the end of the period that he regarded as peak of the visual arts. It is also possible that Antigonus did the same, since he is never cited as an authority on masters or works of the early Hellenistic period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andreae, B. 1998. *Schoenheit des Realismus*. Mainz/Rhein.

Andreae, B. 2004. «Teisikrates». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 437. München.

Angio, F. 2004. «Artisti 'vecchi' e 'nuovi' (Posidippo di Pella, P. Mil. Vogl. viii 309, col. x 8-15)», *Museum Helveticum* 61: 65-71.

Arias, P.E. 1986. «Biton et Kleobis». *LIMC* 3: 119-20.

Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae Supersunt Omnia*. Milan.

Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 1958. «Apollodoro di Atene». *EAA* 1: 474-5.

Broeker, G. 2001 a. «Athenis». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, edited by R. Vollkommer, 104-5. München.

Broeker, G. 2001. «Apelles (i)». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, edited by R. Vollkommer, 62-4. München.

Charles, D. 1997. «Aristotle and the Unity and Essence of Biological Kinds». In *Aristotelische Biologie*, edited by W. Kullmann and S. Föllinger, 27-42. Stuttgart.

Coarelli, F. 1996. *Revixit Ars*. Rome.

Corso, A. 1988a. «Libro trentaquattresimo. Introduzione e note. Libro trentacinquesimo. Introduzione e note. Libro trentaseiesimo. Introduzione e note. Glossario degli artisti ricordati nei libri xxxiv-xxxvi». In *Gaio Plinio Secondo. Storia Naturale*. v.

⁵⁵ See especially Posidippus, *Epigrammata* 62-70, 115 and 142 Austin and Bastianini.

⁵⁶ See Bianchi Bandinelli 1958, 474-5; Montanari 1996, 857-60. On the artistic period epitomised by Pliny with his expression *ars (...) rursus (...) revixit* (Pliny 34.52), see Coarelli 1996.

⁵⁷ A clear (and positive) revaluation of Hellenistic art is stressed in several publications of the early twentieth century, see for example Klein 1921.

Mineralogia e storia dell'arte. Libri 33-37, edited by G. B. Conte, 103-739 and 865-929. Turin.

Corso, A. 1988b. *Prassitele I*. Rome.

Corso, A. 2002. «The Argive Masters at Athens from Pericles to Thrasybulus». *NumAntCl* 31: 91-112.

Despinis, G. 2001. «Vermutungen zum Marathon-Weihgeschenk der Athener in Delphi». *JdI* 116: 103-27.

Dorandi, T. 1999. *Antigone de Caryste*. Paris.

Ebbinghaus, S. 2004. «Theodoros (1)». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 445-7. München.

Ehrhardt, W. 2004. «Mikon». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 82-4. München.

Ehrhardt, W. 2004. «Panainos». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 180-1. München.

Ehrhardt, W. 2004. «Protogenes». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 323-4. München.

Eichholz, D.E. 1962. *Pliny. Natural History* 10. London - Cambridge Mass.

Ferri, S. 1946. *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae quae Pertinent ad Artes Antiquorum*. Rome.

Fittschen, K. 1988. *Griechische Porträts*. Darmstadt.

Hoesch, N. 2000a. «Mikon». *Der Neue Pauly* 8: 162-3.

Hoesch, N. 2000b. «Panainos». *Der Neue Pauly* 9: 225.

Hoesch, N. 2001a. «Polygnotos (i)». *Der Neue Pauly* 10: 58-9.

Hoesch, N. 2001b. «Protogenes». *Der Neue Pauly* 10: 463-4.

von den Hoff, R. 1994. *Philosophenporträts des Früh- und Hochhellenismus*. München.

Jenkins, R.J.H. 1940. «Terracottas». In *Perachora*, edited by H. Payne, 101-4 and 191-255. Oxford.

Isager, J. 1991. *Pliny on Art and Society*, London.

Jex-Blake, K. and Sellers, E. 1896. *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. London.

Karakasi, K. 2001. *Archaische Koren*. München.

Karanastassis, P. 2002. «Hocharchaische Plastik». In *Die Geschichte der antiken Bildhauerkunst. I. Frühgriechische Plastik*, edited by P.C. Bol, 171-222. Mainz.

Keesling, C.M. 2004. «The Hermolikos/Kresilas Base». *ZPE* 147: 79-91.

Keller, O. 1902. *Pseudoacron. Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora* I. Stuttgart.

King, R.A.H. 2001. *Aristotle on Life and Death*. London.

Klein, W. 1921. *Vom Antiken Rokoko*. Vienna.

Kreikenbom, D. 2002. «Reifarchaische Plastik» In *Die Geschichte der Antiken Bildhauerkunst. I. Frühgriechische Plastik*, edited by P.C. Bol, 133-69. Mainz.

La Penna, A. 1957. *Publi Ovidi Nasonis Ibis*. Florence.

Lattanzi, E., *Il Museo Nazionale di Reggio Calabria*. Rome.

Lehmann, L. 2004. «Xenokrates». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 521-2. München.

Lennox, J.G. 2001. *Aristotle's Philosophy of Biology*. Cambridge.

Montanari, F. 1996. «Apollodoros (7, aus Athen)». *Der Neue Pauly* 1: 857-60.

Moreno, P. 1966. «Xenokrates». *EAA* 7: 1234.

Moreno, P. 1987. *Pittura Greca da Polignoto ad Apelle*. Milan.

Moreno, P. 1995. *Lisippo. L'Arte e la Fortuna*. Milan.

Moreno, P. 2000. *Apelle, la Battaglia di Alessandro*. Milan.

Moreno, P. 2004. «Lysippos». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 27-39. München.

Müller, W. 2001a. «Butades». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, edited by R. Vollkommer, 126. München.

Müller, W. 2001b. «Bupalos» In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, edited by R. Vollkommer, 125-6. München.

Müller, W. 2001c. «Antenor (ii)». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, edited by R. Vollkommer, 48-9. München.

Müller, W. 2001d. «Demetrios (i)». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, edited by R. Vollkommer, 163-4. München.

Neudecker, R. 1999. «Lysistratos (2)». *Der Neue Pauly* 7: 612.

Neudecker, R. 2002. «Xenocrates (4)». *Der Neue Pauly* 12/2: 623.

Newhall Stillwell, A. 1952. «The Potters Quarter. The Terracottas». *Corinth* 18. 1.

Nowicka, M. 1993. *Le Portrait dans la Peinture Antique*. Varsovie.

Pollitt, J.J. 1974. *The Ancient View of Greek Art*. New Haven.

Rackham, H. 1952. *Pliny. Natural History* 9. London-Cambridge Mass.

Rausa, F. 1994. *L'Immagine del Vincitore*. Treviso.

Rolley, C. 1994. *La Sculpture Grecque* 1. Paris.

Rolley, C. 1999. *La Sculpture Grecque* 2. Paris.

Rouveret, A. 1989. *Histoire et Imaginaire de la Peinture Ancienne*. Rome.

Russell, O.A. 2001. *Quintilian. The Orator's Education* 5. London-Cambridge Mass.

Schollmeyer, P. 2004. «Lysistratos». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 40. München.

Schweitzer, B. 1932. *Xenocrates von Athen*. Halle.

Settimi, S. 1993. «La trattatistica delle arti figurative». In *Lo Spazio Letterario della Grecia Antica* 1. 2., edited by G. Cambiano, L. Canfora and D. Lanza, 469-98. Rome.

Stewart, A. 1993. *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*. Berkeley.

Strocka, V.M. 2004. «Pheidias». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 210-36. München.

Vatin, C. 1982. «Monuments votifs de Delphes». *BCH* 106: 509-25.

Vollkommer, R. 2004. «(Poly)medes». In *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* 2, edited by R. Vollkommer, 269. München.

Warry, J.G. 1962. *Greek Aesthetic Theory*. London.

Waterflow, S. 1982. *Nature, Change and Agency in Aristotle's Physics*. Oxford.

LIST OF CAPTIONS

1. Head of a clay figurine from Perachora, 675-50 BC, Athens, National Archaeological Museum, no. 16491.
2. Statues probably of Dioscuri, so-called «Cleobis» and «Biton», Delphi, National Archaeological Museum, nos. 1524.4672 and 467.980.
3. Cleobis and Biton carrying a chariot, their mother seating on it, on a bronze coin struck at Argus during the reign of Julia Domna (AD 193-217), Copenhagen, Royal Collection of Coins and Medailles.
4. Cleobis and Biton carrying a chariot, their mother seating on it, on an ara dated to the first half of the first century AD, Rome, Roman National Museum, no. 121.983.
5. Statue of Phrasiclia, by Aristion of Paros, dated to the third quarter of the sixth century BC, Athens, National Archaeological Museum, no. 4889.
6. Marathon's battle, painted on the *Stoa Poikile* at Athens by Micon and Panaenus, reconstruction drawing by Robert.
7. Portrait of Themistocles, Ostia, National Archaeological Museum, no. 85.
8. Portraits of Pericles, Roman copies from the statue of Cresilas, dated to 429 or a little after: on left, marble copy from Tivoli of Hadrianic period, London, British Museum, no. 549; on right, marble copy from Lesbus, of Julio-Claudian period, at Berlin, Altes Museum, Skulpturensammlung, no. 127.
9. Amazonomachy on the shield of Phidias' Athena Parthenos in the Parthenon at Athens, reconstruction drawings by Strocka (left) and Harrison (right).
10. Bronze head from Porticello, at Reggio Calabria, National Archaeological Museum.
11. Marble portrait of Alexander the Great from Tivoli, Roman copy of Hadrianic period from a portrait of Lysippus, formerly in the Azara Collection, now at Paris, Louvre, no. MA 436.

Antonio Corso

12 Massalias,
GR 106 80, Athens, Greece
phones: + 30 210 96 53 245
+ 30 6939 57 13 79
fax + 30 210 92 49 305
e-mail: antoniocorso@hotmail.com



Fig. 1



Fig. 2



Fig. 3



Fig. 4



Fig. 5




Fig. 6




Fig. 8




Fig. 7



Fig. 9



Fig. 10




Fig. 11