

Bryn Mawr College

## Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College

---

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Faculty  
Research and Scholarship

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology

---

4-1-1996

### Review of *Scultura ellenistica*, by Paolo Moreno

Brunilde S. Ridgway

Bryn Mawr College, [bridgway@brynmawr.edu](mailto:bridgway@brynmawr.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs](https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs)



Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

---

#### Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1996. Review of *Scultura ellenistica*, by Paolo Moreno. *American Journal of Archaeology* 100:426-427.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.  
[https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/42](https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/42)

For more information, please contact [repository@brynmawr.edu](mailto:repository@brynmawr.edu).

SCULTURA ELLENISTICA, by *Paolo Moreno*. Pp. xxi + 969 (vol. 1: xi + 1–530; vol. 2: xv–xxi + 533–969), figs. 952. Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, Rome 1994.

Paolo Moreno is well known to all students of Classical art for his copious writings on Lysippos and his monograph on Greek painting; his most recent work is not even represented by the two volumes under review but by the monumental catalogue *Lisippo: L'arte e la fortuna* (Monza 1995) for the exhibition he organized in Rome during Spring–Summer 1995. Readers of his publications will recognize in *Scultura ellenistica* Moreno's typical style and method, perhaps enhanced by his subject's potential appeal for a wider audience than that inhabiting the groves of Academe.

The author acknowledges the uncertainties engendered by ancient circumstances and modern publications on Hellenistic sculpture, and wishes to bring some order into the chaos. He has therefore selected what he considers the most legible monuments with high content and quality, and has attempted his own analysis of them, "temporarily" eliminating previous reconstructions in favor of objective data. He has compared them to "modern" works to bring out their excellence and the continuing validity of their message, and has then placed them within a historical and geographical grid established along the dates of specific events and the best attested centers of Hellenistic production. The results have in part confirmed previous positions, in part led to new insights; all ambiguities have, however, been left out of the main text, with documentation and variant interpretations confined to the endnotes. Thus far Moreno's own statement on methodology (pp. 8–9); readers will ultimately decide whether he has achieved his purpose. I can only present a personal assessment, partly colored by my own research interests that coincide with Moreno's.

The material is arranged within three major chronological divisions: "Classical Manner (323–301)," "Hellenistic Baroque (301–168)," "Roman Restoration (164–31)." These in turn are broken down by geographic areas, each preceded by historical comments and a summary of the main monuments to be treated. A few titles may give the flavor of the book: "Truth and Beauty: Antioch and Nikomedeia (281–168)," "Life in Art: Rhodes from the Earthquake to the Nymphaea (228–166)," "Abstraction: The Last Attalids (168–133)." The monuments are then discussed individually, in independent sections often with allusive headings: "The Scales of Justice" (the Themis by Chairestratos); "The Son Recovered" (the Telephos frieze at Pergamon); "Lunar Eclipse" (Karneades' portrait).

Let us state at once what is good about the book. The amount of information provided—historical, mythological, and literary—is enormous. Bibliography (to 1993) occupies 67 pages (pp. 837–904) and not even all items cited in the notes are included. Moreno's constant references to ancient sources and works in other media (painting and terracotta) are illuminating and valuable. All objects discussed in depth rate at least one illustration; many are shown in more than one view, black-and-white photographs of high quality alternating with abundant color reproductions. Meaningful juxtapositions and focus on de-

tails are exploited throughout. The text is written in a poetic style that brings to life the various sculptural creations; descriptions include more than formal analysis, and the message conveyed by each monument examined is woven into a running narrative of contemporary events that gives the impression of an eyewitness account. How much original thinking permeates the findings is summarized in six dense pages of "New Proposals" (pp. 16–21), arranged both chronologically and geographically, which, I believe, do not do full justice to the many excellent insights scattered throughout. Scholarship is remarkably up to date, including unpublished information; even one of the bronzes from Punta del Serrone (Taranto), which came to light as recently as summer 1992, is illustrated in two views (figs. 792, 796) and identified as Aemilius Paullus.

Now the drawbacks. Minimal grounds often exist for suggestions like the one just mentioned: comparison with a diminutive face on the Delphic pillar and two marble heads also theoretically identified is insufficient to prove the point. The same criticism can be leveled at many proposals, whether originating with Moreno or simply accepted from other sources. Wildly innovative in some cases, the author can be very traditional in other respects. He still believes in assigning different slabs of the Halikar-nassos Amazonomachy to Skopas and his colleagues, despite recent criticism to the contrary. The resulting attributions inevitably lack foundation. Comparisons are not always convincing, and eventually lose their impact—for instance, the Poseidon of Melos (p. 353) is said to be Alexandrian, but to have Pergamene and Athenian parallels. This diffusion of influences and styles may correspond to ancient reality, but single geographic assignments therefore become dangerous and unsustainable. Reconstructions of ancient biographies are imaginative but unrealistic, especially when ancient sources are treated with only relative regard for their own dates and reliability. Little distinction is made between Roman copies and Greek originals, and often prototypes are advocated (and geographically attributed) on the basis of evidence from much later times, which the captions to the various photographs never acknowledge. Chronology, despite the initial statement, receives uneven attention; it is often difficult to find which date Moreno advocates for a specific piece. Even treatment of individual monuments varies, some receiving such brief mentions that one wonders at their inclusion, others occupying a place disproportionate to the evidence.

My main objection deals with documentation. The ample bibliography listed in the notes is occasionally accompanied by a summary of the authors' opinions, when they diverge but little from Moreno's viewpoint. When there is total disagreement, this is so seldom acknowledged that the approach borders on hubris. I am not referring just to my positions (my publications are usually cited, my ideas almost never), but also to those of others whose writings I know (e.g., Weis on the Marsyas, Linfert on the Crouching Aphrodite). The unaware readers are given no inkling that matters are not quite as clear-cut as presented, unless they retrace Moreno's entire bibliography; the prefatory statement is insufficient warning.

In brief, a splendid book with much to offer but little to accept unquestionably; a stimulating book deceptively

convincing; a dangerous book because of its very learning. It should provoke much healthy debate.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND  
NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY  
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE  
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

ROOFED THEATERS OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY, by  
*George C. Izenour*. Pp. xxi + 231, figs. 183, map  
1. Yale University Press, New Haven and London  
1992. \$120. ISBN 0-300-04685-5.

Written by a theater designer and design historian in a style and format more familiar to architects than archaeologists, this book addresses the question of how Greek and Roman covered theaters (*odeia*) were roofed. Izenour is interested in the evolution of ancient roofed theaters rather than the more common outdoor theaters because the odeion as described by Vitruvius formed the basis for the design of Renaissance and Baroque theaters. His stated goal (pp. xiv–xv) is to consider the design of covered theaters technologically rather than aesthetically, because he feels that theater history has been governed largely by the latter criterion. He concentrates on roofing systems in order to re-create the ruined odeia of classical antiquity as architectural spaces devoted to public performances, and thus to gain some idea of how they might have worked, including such admittedly speculative questions as their acoustical properties. Although these lines of inquiry do not correspond to the methodology that a classical archaeologist would have used to present the material, Izenour's concise summaries of the evidence for a large number of odeia, many obscure or published in foreign languages, make it a valuable reference tool. In addition, as an active theater designer, Izenour offers a number of provocative interpretations that should spark some reevaluation of Roman theater presentations.

Izenour begins by examining Greek columnar halls, of which only the Odeion of Pericles was surely used for public performances. He concludes that this type of building probably did not work well for performances, and proceeds to the Hellenistic bouleuteria at Priene and Miletos, where truss systems were utilized to create the earliest assembly halls with clear-spanned auditoria (the earlier bouleuterion in the Athenian Agora is discussed briefly in an extensive footnote). Izenour concludes the first section of his work with accounts of the bouleuteria at Termessos and Arriasos in Caria. These are particularly useful since both were published in 1892 (in German).

Having surveyed the sparse Greek evidence for clear-spanned auditoria, Izenour proceeds to the much more extensive Roman odeia of Late Republican and Imperial date. He limits himself to the best-preserved covered theaters from Asia Minor to Gaul, presenting plans, sections, and a reconstruction of the roofing system for each. These include a number of buildings designed as covered theaters (such as examples at Pompeii, Augusta Praetoria, and Aphrodisias), and also buildings remodeled into odeia from

preexisting structures (such as at Cosa and Epidauros). He concludes this section with accounts of a number of enigmatic "odeia," where the roofing system is problematic or may not have existed (such as that of Herodes Atticus at Athens, or those at Ephesos, and Patrae). The result is a clear picture of the essential similarities and differences in this common public building in Roman cities. It is also Izenour's belief (p. 63) that serious public performances during the Imperial period took place indoors as they generally do today, a contention that deserves some attention.

The third chapter deals primarily with the acoustics of Graeco-Roman covered theaters, a valuable, if somewhat speculative, account due to the author's knowledge of actual theater design. Izenour's text concludes with a brief "coda" on the evolution of modern theater design, in which he compares the Odeion of Agrippa at Athens and the Bayreuth Festspielhaus. There follow eight appendices, which include useful summaries of the evolution of the timber truss and theater seating in classical antiquity, an account of Roman remodeling of Greek outdoor theaters into arenas, and a stimulating and provocative argument against the use of drop curtains and movable painted scenery in outdoor theaters in antiquity.

As stated above, this book has virtues. Most of the roofing systems Izenour proposes seem reasonable; that offered for Gortyn looked peculiar to me (but then Izenour himself is unhappy with his solution), and I preferred his first to his final solution for the odeion at Aphrodisias. The manuscript would have benefited from a reading by a classical archaeologist, since it contains a number of minor errors, omissions, or peculiar statements. For example, the Odeion of Pericles is described (p. 31) as designed for lectures by orators and philosophers; it probably was so used from the fourth century B.C. on, but this purpose seems unlikely at the time of its initial construction. On page 45, the bouleuteria at Priene and Miletos are described as closely indebted to the model of the bouleuterion at Athens because the two cities were colonies of Athens. This seems an unlikely reason for similarities in public structures with the same function that were constructed 800–900 years after the Ionian migration. On page 114 Cosa is located on a "Campanian hilltop," Izenour neglects to mention that the city was abandoned in the mid-first century B.C., and he dates the reoccupation to the time of Claudius rather than Augustus (see *PECS* 246). There are also a couple of minor typographical errors.

Izenour presents his conclusions primarily through drawings that make it easy to evaluate his arguments and understand a building type that has largely been ignored. Enough photographic evidence is provided to illustrate the accuracy of his drawings. A relatively complete bibliography is provided at the end of the book, to which now should be added R.C. Beacham's *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* (Cambridge, Mass. 1992).

SHELLEY C. STONE

DEPARTMENT OF FINE ARTS  
CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, BAKERSFIELD  
9001 STOCKDALE HIGHWAY  
BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA 93311-1099  
SSTONE@CSUBAK.EDU