

**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

---

1999

*Review of Regional Schools in Hellenistic Sculpture: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, March 15-17, 1996*, edited by Olga Palagia and William Coulson

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

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

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

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

---

#### Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1999. Review of *Regional Schools in Hellenistic Sculpture: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, March 15-17, 1996*, edited by Olga Palagia and William Coulson. *American Journal of Archaeology* 103:717-719.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/70](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/70)

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

identification is a subjective matter. What is revealing about Andreae's approach, however, is the argument he subsequently constructs: The portrait must be by Nikeratos of Athens, because he is known to have undertaken commissions in the time of Eumenes. Resemblance of this head to that of the Diomedes of the Sperlonga Palladion group indicates that the original of that group too must be the work of Nikeratos. Another similar work, the famous "Hellenistic Prince" in the Terme, also shares some features; it must be a portrait of Eumenes' brother and successor Attalos II (it is "brüderlich verwandt" to the so-called Eumenes); this too comes from the workshop of Nikeratos, who is thus characterized as a "key figure" of artistic development of the early second century and the teacher of Phylomachos, who, to judge from his fame as implied by literary sources, must have been the master of the Pergamon Altar. Such streams of reasoning, according to Andreae, add new insights to our understanding of Hellenistic sculpture.

Andreae's book is in many ways an expansion of an article he published a decade ago that lists several dozen datable examples of Hellenistic sculpture (in H.-U. Cain et al. eds., *Festschrift N. Himmelmann* [Mainz 1989] 237-44). Here, framed between introductory and concluding remarks, each of 39 short sections treats a single monument or group for which Andreae feels the evidence is sufficient to establish a chronological and geographical context. This is essential since the overriding theme of the book, as its title indicates, is that Hellenistic art must be understood in terms of interplay among the roles of patron, artist, and viewer—true enough as such is true for all works of art. Thus he needs to focus on works for which these three entities can be identified—or at least imagined. A second theme of the book is development; at several points in his introductory comments Andreae raises the question of whether a stylistic sequence for Hellenistic art is possible to establish. He hints that such a task will be made possible by his lining up of datable monuments; the concluding sections leave no doubt—29 of the fixed points are reillustrated with dates in the margins of a text, which marches the reader through an evolution of Hellenistic sculptural style. Although, to be fair, Andreae's model is more flexible than most, it still assumes that detected differences between works indicate generally valid developmental phenomena.

Two points are, I think, paramount. One cannot blame Andreae for the enormous variability of the monuments—copies, originals, and adaptations with and without external evidence for their date, origin, and location for display. However, the "house of cards" manner of reasoning, outlined above, characterizes much of the presentation. The basic underpinnings for the major arguments do not fill the reader's mind with confidence. The second point is more troubling still. Even if one could suspend disbelief (after all, we do not want to despair of knowing anything) and establish a list of dated monuments, does that necessarily represent a development? Or is development something we impose on the monuments? The key is implicit in Andreae's title. To him, the distinction between Classical and Hellenistic art lies essentially in the phenomenon of realism. Classical art rejects realism in the interest of beauty; Hellenistic art embraces realism and expresses the beauty inherent in it (the "Schönheit des Realismus"). In fact, what increasingly characterizes art as we move from

the Classical to the Hellenistic (and the evolution is gradual) is an increasing play between beauty (or various forms of idealization) and realism (or various forms of characterization and exaggeration). These modes of representation depend on one another for their ability to signify; yet they necessarily coexist, so models of exclusionary, sequential stylistic development become highly inappropriate.

With these caveats in hand Andreae's book is actually quite useful. Well-produced and exceptionally fully illustrated with many crisp black-and-white images, it embodies Andreae's thorough and current scholarship both through his valuable insights on individual monuments and through the carefully selected references. Scholarship on Hellenistic art is more than anything a discourse among sharply contrasting approaches and views, and this book is a worthy and accessible representative of what remains a very significant segment.

MARK D. FULLERTON

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF ART  
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY  
100 HAYES HALL, 108 NORTH OVAL MALL  
COLUMBUS, OH 43210-1318  
FULLERTON.1@OSU.EDU

REGIONAL SCHOOLS IN HELLENISTIC SCULPTURE:  
PROCEEDINGS OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE HELD AT THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS, MARCH 15-17, 1996, edited by *Olga Palagia* and *William Coulson*. (Oxbow Monograph 90.) Pp. ix + 291, figs. 352. Oxbow Books, Oxford 1998. \$98. ISBN 1-900188-45-7 (cloth).

In recent years several international conferences have taken place at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and they have all been highly rewarding—not least because they frequently present new material and are speedily published. The book under review is the result of one such meeting and almost the sequel to a previous encounter. As the editors state in their "Foreword" the conference on sculpture from Arkadia and Lakonia had shown "that sculpture is still a major concern in a changing world," and that an analysis of regional characteristics might prove fruitful for different times and places—hence the selection of the theme. I heartily concur with the editors' view that "Greek sculpture still lies at the core of the study of Classical archaeology," and I believe their point is fully demonstrated by this elegant and important book which has much to offer to all students of the Greek past. Whether the papers here presented succeed in demonstrating the existence of local Hellenistic schools is a different matter.

Of the 29 papers given at the Conference all but one are published, although in a different order from that of presentation. It is also obvious that the contributors profited from comments made by both the audience and the editors, one of whom (Palagia) is consistently thanked for bibliographical references and sculptural insights. It is therefore ironic that the only consequential typographical error

occurs in her paper: Palagia p. 23, first column, line 6 from the bottom, should read “which should *not* be dated after . . .”—an important chronological point. The book is otherwise almost totally free from misspellings, and the abundant photographs are sharp and useful. Seven articles are in modern Greek, but some Greek scholars opted to write in English, as did the two German and the single French contributors.

Many monuments are treated here for the first time—note especially the impressive kore from Kallipolis/Kallion (P. Themelis), two statues in the Piraeus Museum (O. Palagia and M. Pologiorgi respectively), and the colossal head of a goddess from the Agora (A. Stewart). Other pieces, already published or well-known, are considered at much greater depth, from a different angle, or given new chronology and interpretation (e.g., the Mahdia roundels [H. von Prittwitz]; the statuary group comprising the so-called Delphi philosopher [W. Geominy]; the Mahdia figured bronzes attributed to Delos [B. Barr-Sharrar]; and the Atlas in Thessaloniki [Th. Stephanidou-Tiberiou]). Some sculptures make their first appearance as typological groupings: the Hellenistic statuary from Corinth (M. Sturgeon), 14 funerary monuments from the Athenian Agora (J. Grossman), and votive reliefs to Apollo Kitharoidos from Asia Minor (L. Roccas). The coffered ceilings of both the propylon to the “Temenos” (now “Hall of Choral Dancers”) and the pronaos to the Hieron at Samothrace are given important reconstructions by A. Mantis. The Hieron pronaos has been further enriched by two smaller panels (in Kavala and on Thasos), which allow divine busts to be visualized between the larger coffers with prancing centaurs holding branches.

A certain amount of overlapping among parallels (with helpful cross-references) serves to link discussions and support chronology. The material treated ranges from possibly late fourth-century monuments (G. Waywell’s Lion of Knidos; Palagia’s Macedonian) to the first century B.C. statuettes from Paestum (J. Pedley), but two articles deal with later works: I. Lebenti uses “Roman copies” to visualize the Hygieia and Asklepios made by Nikeratos for Pergamon but eventually taken to Rome, and R.R.R. Smith presents a group of sculptures in distinctive Hellenistic style from an Imperial (second or fourth century?) workshop at Aphrodisias. Geographically, the range extends to Greek echoes in clay-and-stucco reliefs in second century A.D. Afghanistan (K. Schwab) and to Phoenician preferences in sarcophagi (C. Houser). Two articles concentrate on technical details (P. Jockey on unfinished marbles in Delos and P. Higgs on sculptures from Bodrum in the British Museum), but several include comments on tooling and joining methods.

Two papers are frankly theoretical. M. Fullerton tackles the difficult issue of Neo-Attic sculpture, which he sees in function of its decorative nature rather than its style; based primarily on types, only exceptionally on famous prototypes, the production is therefore independent of any Classicizing or retrospective trend allegedly beginning around 150 B.C. The Mahdia wreck would provide the earliest available evidence for the existence of the genre. J. Marszal uses the testimony of inscribed bases to show that Attalid

commemorative monuments were less innovative than usually assumed. His criticism of the favorable slant given by modern scholarship to Pergamene actions is justifiable—a somewhat similar point is made by A. Mielsch (*AA* [1995] 765–79). If Classicism is a continuous Hellenistic option and tradition is a strong element in Pergamene art, could the colossal head of Herakles discussed by D. Damaskos belong to the now missing but central hero on the Altar Gigantomachy? Its dimensions (32 cm from hair roots to chin) seem compatible with those of the Workshop Torso (42 cm from tip of beard to head crown).

I could comment on each article, but the brevity of discussion imposed by a book review would amount to a hit-and-run proposition. I therefore focus on those papers that best address the conference theme. Although all authors endeavored to look at their material from a regional perspective, few succeeded in isolating not a school but at best a workshop manner. Indeed, a definition of “school” is not attempted until p. 177 (Jockey), and then used to deny that any such existed on Delos. The impressive reconstruction of a colossal figure (Mithradates VI?) on Melos leads I. Trianti to group with it four statues (including the famous Aphrodite) as products of a single workshop with possible Rhodian affinities. Yet B. Machaira describes production on Rhodes as typical of the Hellenistic melting pot, although she carefully distinguishes between reproductions of established types and Hellenistic innovations. In the same vein C. Mattusch points out the many styles that could coexist in a Rhodian workshop; and if I. Mark persists in attributing the Nike of Samothrace to Rhodes, he does so largely on historical grounds and on the alleged (but now contested) Rhodian prominence in the carving of the Pergamon Altar. That the international market would preclude a traditional regional style in late Hellenistic Athens is stated by von Prittwitz, and seconded by Smith, who sees statuary more as “an expression of common cultural identity” than of local preference. And although E. Walter-Karydi convincingly ascribes to a “northern Asia Minor school” a bronze bust of the “elemental” Skylla, her focus is on the widespread and fluid iconography of the *Mischwesen* through time (see now her article in *JdI* 112 [1997] 167–89). The concept of Hellenistic regional schools, so long a tenet of sculptural studies, is now being undermined by a more objective reading of the evidence, especially for the last two centuries of the period. Only sustained production at the artisans’ level—the manufacture of grave-stones or votive reliefs that cater to a stable clientele—might allow regional distinctions and identification.

A basic consensus seems to emerge from these papers: various stylistic trends could occur simultaneously; affinities existed from area to area; sculptors travelled widely and worked in different places; the demands of the Roman market led to a diversified production conditioned by purpose rather than by masters. In this respect the rare attempts to detect the influence of the “big names” on later works appear somewhat old-fashioned, especially the alleged inspiration from the Herakles Epitrapezios that to me seems a Roman construct without Lysippan connections. Admittedly I read all articles from my biased point of view, but surprisingly I find myself in agreement with most

of them. Other readers may draw different conclusions, but all are bound to find much of value in this book. The editors are warmly congratulated.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND NEAR EASTERN  
ARCHAEOLOGY  
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE  
BRYN MAWR, PA 19010  
BRIDGWAY@BRYNMAWR.EDU

PROPYLON UND BOGENTOR: UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUM TETRAPHYLON VON LATAKIA UND ANDEREN FRÜHKAISERZEITLICHEN BOGENMONUMENTEN IM NAHEN OSTEN, by *Ingeborg Kader*. (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Orient-Abteilung. Damaszener Forschungen 7.) Pp. x + 208, pls. 53, figs. 88, tables 2. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1996. DM 198. ISBN 3-8053-1866-9.

LES ARCS ROMAINS DE JÉRUSALEM: ARCHITECTURE, DÉCOR ET URBANISME, by *Caroline Arnould*. (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 35.) Pp. 319, pls. 23, figs. 36. Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1997. SFr 98 (paper). ISBN 3-525-53910-X (cloth); 3-7278-1141-2 (paper).

In recent years late Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urbanism in the Near East has become more and more a subject for archaeological and historical research. Of particular interest are processes of exchange and interdependence between local regional traditions and the input of Hellenistic and Roman innovations, emphasizing a regional perspective on urbanism and the formation of local city states in Hellenistic and Roman times. Within this context monumental architecture and its decoration play a major role and are prime subjects for a discussion that is taken up and advanced, in different ways, by the two publications under review here.

Ingeborg Kader's study, a doctoral thesis from Cologne University, continues a discussion started by Edmund Weigand under the same title, "Propylon und Bogentor in der östlichen Reichskunst" (*Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* [1930] 72–114). The starting point of her analysis is the tetrapylon of Latakia, up till now usually called a "triumphal arch" and dated to the late second or early third century A.D. Based on a detailed *Bauaufnahme*, a well argued and convincing reconstruction, and splendid documentation in drawings and photographs, the author develops a deep and wide-ranging discussion of the monument itself: its architecture, its architectural decoration, its function and meaning, its urbanistic context, as well as a large body of comparative material. Among all this, reflections about the possibilities of the dome construction are of special interest. Her conclusions suggest that the monument should be dated to Augustan or early Imperial times and

must be interpreted as a propylon-like entrance to a probable sacred temenos, an area that could have been dedicated already to a Hellenistic ruler cult and was later the site of a Roman imperial cult. As far as the date is concerned one could hesitate before accepting this early dating, based mainly on the stylistic evidence of capitals and on the chronological reassessments made recently by a group of German scholars, especially K. S. Freyberger (as opposed to such French scholars as J. Dentzer-Feydy), who are cited here to support Kader's study. Cross-references to other such precariously "dated" monuments (e.g., the temple at Slim [n. 210] or the dome of the "bath" at Si' [n. 893]) are not really convincing, risking therefore the danger of *circuli viciosi*. Further studies will have to prove whether a later dating of the monument, to the second century A.D., is to be excluded. If one does accept the early dating of the tetrapylon of Latakia, our view of the history of architecture in this region must be fundamentally changed, and not just the development of dome-shaped architecture.

With the same complex methodological approach and scientific precision, Kader then enlarges her study to monumental arches (*Bogentore*) and extramural gate monuments (*Stadttormonumente*) of the region, such as the Temenos gate at Petra and the Nabatean gate at Bosra, as well as arched monuments at Damascus, Gadara, Tiberias, and Tyros. New reconstructions and a rich comparative study demonstrate not only the author's stunning knowledge of the monuments and scholarship but also her skill at leading discussions on the highest international level. In good German tradition many of the book's detailed arguments are placed in the footnotes, which does not make for an easy read. Kader leads us, nonetheless, to the convincing conclusion that most of the arched monuments in the region must be understood within the urbanism of early Imperial times. Thus the author draws a new, complex, and definitive picture of architectural, urbanistic, social, and cultural development in Syria in the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

Caroline Arnould's study, which also began as a doctoral thesis (for the *École Pratique des Hautes Études*), concerns two monumental arches at Jerusalem: the *Ecce Homo* arch and the arch underneath the Damascus Gate. The dating, as well as the function, of both arches have been controversial up till now. The author collects and analyses all available data for both monuments: the history of their discovery and research, written sources, archaeological remains, and topographic surroundings. Working within a comparative framework, Arnould considers the archaeological remains and surrounding topography in detailed relation to selected examples of other arches and gateways of the Near East, as well as of other regions of the Roman empire. The results seem to be convincing: the *Ecce Homo* arch should be dated to the second half of the second century A.D., and the Damascus Gate arch to the Hadrianic period. While the former is explained as a monumental gate to the area occupied by the Roman legion, the latter will have been related to the foundation of *Aelia Capitolina*, defining its northern limit. Finally, the two arches are considered not only as isolated monuments, but within the larger framework of the urban development of Jerusalem.