

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

---

10-1-1994

### The Study of Classical Sculpture at the End of the 20th Century

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. 1994. The Study of Classical Sculpture at the End of the 20th Century. *American Journal of Archaeology* 98:759-772.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.  
[https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/100](https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/100)

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

## REVIEW ARTICLE

# The Study of Classical Sculpture at the End of the 20th Century

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

SCULTURA GRECA DEL IV SECOLO. MAESTRI E SCUOLE DI STATUARIA TRA CLASSICITÀ ED ELLENISMO, by *Luigi Todisco*. (Repertori fotografici Longanesi & C. 8.) Pp. 507, figs. 41, pls. 427. Longanesi & C., Milan 1993. Lit 360,000. ISBN 88-304-1111-6.

The year 1993 has marked the centenary of Adolf Furtwängler's influential *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik*, and such an important anniversary should not pass unnoticed.<sup>1</sup> That book signaled the beginning of a strong current in studies of ancient sculpture, one that is usually known by such German terms as *Meisterforschung* and *Kopienkritik*. It was based on the premise that the style of ancient sculptors could, and should, be identified through the Roman replicas of their lost originals, and proceeded on the assumption that attributions could be made not only on the authority of mentions in the ancient sources but also on purely formal and iconographic grounds. In the words of Andrew Stewart, "the continuing spell of Furtwängler's achievement, and of the great sculptors themselves, has ensured that much of the bibliography of Greek sculpture still addresses, one way or another, these basic concerns, often to the detriment of other lines of inquiry."<sup>2</sup>

It seems therefore fitting to choose this moment to review the status of Greek sculptural studies 100 years later. In particular, it may be appropriate to do so using

a 1993 publication as a starting point: Luigi Todisco's *Scultura greca del IV secolo*. Although restricted to a single century, as contrasted with Furtwängler's ampler coverage,<sup>3</sup> this monograph at the same time marks what is newest and what is still the same in our field. I shall start by reviewing Todisco's book, and shall then attempt to define other current trends, in an overview of methodological theories and publications. Needless to say, my selection will be guided by purely personal and subjective criteria, necessarily informed by my own preferences and restricted by the limits of my own knowledge.

### ANCIENT ART AS ARCHAEOLOGY

"Not until about 10 years ago was it first explicitly acknowledged that it is impossible to exclude the contribution of artistic and artifactual manifestations from the process of reconstructing the history of ancient Greek society."<sup>4</sup> This emphatic statement on the value of ancient art forms the premise of Todisco's major study dedicated to Greek sculpture of the fourth century B.C. It joins a chorus of other voices that have recently been raised, in this country and abroad, in defense of the study of classical art as an intrinsic part of classical archaeology—a defense that would have been considered astonishing, or at least superfluous, at the turn of this century, but which has become increasingly necessary as such pursuits have been viewed as extraneous, even frivolous, within the context of "true" archaeology.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to the Editor-in-Chief of *AJA*, who invited me to provide this review, and to the friends who have commented on a first draft of this article: A.A. Donohue, G.R. Edwards, M.D. Fullerton, and P. Rehak.

Throughout this essay, the term classical (in lower case) refers to both Greek and Roman art, whereas Classical (capitalized) applies specifically to that of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The bibliography at the end of this text is meant not only as a list of abbreviations, but also as an overview of recent important works on Greek sculpture.

<sup>2</sup> Stewart 1990, 30. It is perhaps worth noting that Stewart himself is under the spell of the ancient masters, not only because of his 1977 monograph on Skopas, but also since his 1990 book gives such a large part to their oeuvres, albeit "in context," on which see *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Note, however, that because of his emphasis on artistic personalities, the German scholar paid relatively little attention to the Archaic and the Hellenistic phases, for which proportionately few sculptors' names could be recovered from the ancient sources and from the evidence then available.

---

<sup>4</sup> The entire quotation, in its original language, reads: "Paradossalmente, solo a poco più di dieci anni fa risale dunque il primo esplicito riconoscimento anche della imprescindibilità del valore delle espressioni artigianali ed artistiche nel processo di ricostruzione storica della società greca antica" (Todisco 1993, 11).

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Snodgrass 1987, 132–33: "It seems to me a strength, not a weakness, of classical archaeology that it should automatically be taken to include the study of art, and that the same people should often choose to practice, and be required to teach, in both fields. The special contribution the subject can make to art history derives from this very circumstance, that the same people can be expected both to offer the artistic analysis *and* to have mastered the archaeological evidence." He then cites R. Bianchi Bandinelli, who in 1966 could charge "that classical archaeology is guilty of 'the almost total abandonment of art history'." The same thought is echoed by M. Torelli, in Todisco 1993, 8, where he laments that classical sculpture is ever more neglected by current archaeological research ("sempre più negletta dalle ricerche dell'archeologia contemporanea").

Once again I find myself in the unenviable position of having to uphold the *archaeological* approach to ancient sculpture, but this time not in contrast to the art historical one.<sup>6</sup> Rather, my comments are meant to address the current tendencies in archaeological circles—not only the strongly anthropological and sociological ones of the so-called (albeit now almost defunct) New Archaeology, which would virtually eschew ancient art from consideration, but also the more favorable, such as the theoretical ones based on structuralism and semiotics, and the more traditional, focusing on masters and masterpieces. Certainly, the study of ancient sculpture has benefited from all these approaches, and the last half century has witnessed a considerable shift and progress in our studies;<sup>7</sup> yet much remains to be done for the field of ancient art, specifically sculpture, to be ranked by most archaeologists at the same “objective” level of, say, Greek epigraphy and architecture.

#### SCULTURA GRECA DEL IV SECOLO

Todisco's book is volume 8 in the series of the *Repertori fotografici* published by Longanesi & C. The reader is therefore led to expect that the illustrative corpus will form a major component of the work. Its 427 photographs and 41 line drawings confirm such expectation, and the quality of the plates is almost invariably superb, even when dealing with such mediocre figures as heavily restored Roman statues with their incongruous attributes and chaste fig leaves (e.g., fig. 60). A foreword by Mario Torelli explains the motivation for this book precisely within the context of comparable photographic corpora, but joined to a modern and critical text meant to exemplify the current state of our knowledge. Todisco himself, in his preface, pays homage to the influential views of Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, here extensively quoted together with other contemporary Italian scholars who stress the unity of the archaeological inventory, whether sherd or statue; he also acknowledges the difficulty of establishing a historical profile of fourth-century sculpture in the round, given the almost total lack of freestanding Greek originals. Yet Todisco has given his book a revealing subtitle: *Maestri e scuole di statuaria tra classicità ed ellenismo*. He has therefore focused on the great names that have come down to us from antiquity, and on whatever sculptural schools can be gleaned from the evidence of extant monuments and statue bases. In so doing, he has produced a text both progressive and retardataire, critical yet still subjective, remarkably well informed but also somewhat deficient in acknowledging problems and controversial opinions.

To be sure, the author addresses his work not only to all students of classical culture but also to a larger public generally interested in the roots of Western art (p. 12). The format, without footnotes or specific references in the main text, is in keeping with this wider scope. Yet bibli-

ographical guidelines are topically grouped on pages 469–72, an extensive list of abbreviations provides an impressive scholarly documentation updated to 1992 (with even the occasional 1993 item), and lengthy captions to the illustrations serve as concise catalogue entries, citing the most significant or recent publications on each piece—chosen, however, according to the author's preferences. This format eliminates the need for crediting variant theories, and occasionally allows the author to waver in his position without taking a stand. For instance, the legend to figure 4 attributes the Ares Borghese to Alkameles with a question mark and refers to Hartswick 1990, but the text on page 39 does not give the grounds for the hesitation; similarly, both figure 5 (the Velletri Athena) and figure 6 (the Cherkel Athena) are captioned as the Hephaistia by the same master, the apparent contradiction being tacitly resolved by a larger umbrella over both: “after Attic originals of the Pheidian school.” Out of a total of 317 plates (some showing multiple views of the same piece), only 94 carry no question mark after attribution or cautionary terms such as “possible” or “probable” in their identification. This (dis)proportion becomes all the more significant when one considers the many examples of architectural and animal sculpture included, whose identification is not in question. In addition, only figures in the round are illustrated, save for the few reliefs that are connected to a master's name or are thought to reflect lost masterpieces. As a result, fourth-century originals such as gravestones and votive reliefs are omitted, as products of anonymous craftsmen.<sup>8</sup>

In its general conception, this book is admirable. An introductory chapter articulated into sections outlines the history of Greek culture (*greçità*) within the fourth century: 1) historical events from 404 to ca. 300 B.C., not only on the Greek mainland and in Asia Minor, but also (extensively and commendably) in Magna Graecia; 2) political institutions, analyzed by area; 3) economic conditions; 4) intellectual history and philosophy; and 5) city planning, architecture, and the various art forms, by region, including Lycia, Karia, and Macedonia (in this order). The main discussion then follows, with chapters on “Orientation and Problems” and one on sculptural antecedents. A useful listing of fourth-century sculptors, by region, is derived from extant statue bases (often drawn with surviving imprints) together with those literary sources establishing collaboration and chronology. A stemma of members of the “School of Polykleitos” leads to a discussion of masters by generation, and moves from archaeological evidence to modern attributions. Sections on “Masters of Architectural Sculpture” cover the latest reconstructions of the Xanthian Nereid Monument and the Asklepieion at Epidauros, the latter articulated into discussions of participating artists. Here Timotheos is credited with both one set of akroteria and the models for one pedimental composition (p. 57), which on the next page turn into models for the entire sculptural program

<sup>6</sup> For my previous efforts, see Ridgway 1986, and my answer to William Hood in *ArtB* 68 (1986) 480–82. See also, intended for an archaeological audience, Ridgway 1982 and 1991b.

<sup>7</sup> For a history of the development of sculptural studies, see, e.g., Stewart 1990, 29–32.

<sup>8</sup> Such reliefs are, however, occasionally mentioned; see, e.g., p. 102.

of the temple and give the master total supervision for the work. Yet philologists keep stressing that τύποι cannot be translated as “models,” and W. Posch’s recent proposal (*AA* 1991, 69–73) for a different interpretation (relief/appliqués for the dark limestone slabs forming the base of the cult image) is overlooked.

With the entry on Timotheos, Todisco begins his expanded coverage of fourth-century masters, relying now on stylistic attributions and ancient sources even when archaeological evidence is unavailable: Demetrios, Kephisodotos I, Praxiteles, Skopas, Bryaxis, Euphranor, Leochares, Silanion, Lysippos, Lysistratos, Praxiteles’ sons and pupils, the sculptor of the Akanthos Column in Delphi,<sup>9</sup> Chairestratos, and Lysippos’s sons and pupils. It is here that Todisco, despite his admirable premises and his vast learning, reverts to antiquated models, attributing works purely on the basis of the laconic listings in Pliny or other ancient sources, and subscribing to traditional views of a sculptor’s style even without ancient documentation.

Just a few examples. The discussion on Skopas uses the term *pathos* no fewer than 13 times, and considers a new formulation of it the distinctive component of the best Skopasian style (p. 87). Yet no single ancient source mentions *pathos* in connection with the Parian master, and our modern interpretation is largely based on the pedimental sculptures of the Athenaion at Tegea, of which Skopas is known to have been the *architect*. The current chain of stylistic attributions stems nonetheless from this very body of highly fragmentary and not particularly well carved pieces—including the famous Meleager type known only through copies, which can claim a Skopasian paternity primarily because it shares its subject matter with one Tegean pediment, although obvious local connections explain the mythological choice for the gable. Todisco stresses rather Meleager’s expression of *pathos*, which he considers typically Skopasian as manifested in the Dresden Maenad, the Copenhagen/Dresden Herakles, and the Pothos—all attributions that have been and will continue to be questioned.

Similarly, in discussing the Hermes of Olympia (pp. 75–76), Todisco accepts it as a Neo-Attic work, but also as a “rather faithful” rendition of a Praxitelean marble original, which can then be used to corroborate other hypothetical attributions. We sense here the same romantic determination to flesh out the personality and oeuvre of

one of the most famous names preserved for us by the ancient sources, on minimal objective grounds, that informs A. Corso’s otherwise useful trilogy (1988, 1990, 1992), as well as the writings of many other modern authors. How can we be sure, for instance, that the Pouring Satyr type copies the bronze original from the Athenian Street of Tripods and that therefore “its *pais* sweetness reflects the docility appropriate to the slaves of the class to which the wealthy sponsor of the work belonged” (pp. 67–68)? In the same vein, Lysippos is said to have known Alexander the Great since (the ruler’s) childhood (p. 120), and the Macedonian is credited with carrying around with him the Herakles Epitrapezios “since the time of the campaign against Thebes” (p. 117). Yet no reliable ancient source I can find gives this specific information.<sup>10</sup> Recreating the social and chronological context of a work of art is highly desirable, but at times the line between reconstructive history and fiction seems dangerously thin.

Perhaps my most serious objection to this book, and in general to comparable studies of Greek sculpture, is the amount of emotionalism involved in stylistic judgment. If a work can be attributed to a major master, no matter on what tenuous grounds, then even a mediocre Roman version cannot prevent a glowing description and interpretation. If, in contrast, no famous name can be connected with a statue, even if a Greek original, or no attribute is preserved to clarify its message, then judgment is suspended or adjectives like “cold” and “academic” are used.<sup>11</sup> Todisco, and many others as well, tend to read into the ancient pieces what they believe should be there, ready to reconsider if a different attribution or chronology can be argued. Roman copies are given as much significance as Greek works, and nowhere is the problem addressed that renderings could be modified to suit the taste of the Roman patrons. Moreover, a Greek prototype is sought behind each sculpture, even when outright Roman creation in imitation of Greek styles can be suspected.<sup>12</sup> It is this persistent bias, combined with the uncertainty and complexity of the “attribution game,” that has given sculptural studies a poor reputation in archaeological circles, or, at best, a skeptical reception.

I do not want to give the impression that Todisco’s book has little value. To the contrary. As an in-depth study of the sculpture of a specific century (a rare feature in itself), with excellent photographs even of little-known pieces,

<sup>9</sup> Todisco 138 “drastically” refutes attribution of the Column Karyatids to Praxiteles, but more recent discussion seems to support the epigraphical reading proposed by C. Vatin (which includes that master’s signature) on the authority of Corso 1988: J. de Waele, *RA* 1993, 123–27, esp. 127.

<sup>10</sup> Pliny’s comment about Lysippos (*HN* 34.63: *a pueritia eius* [sc. Alexander] *orsus*) can scarcely be credited; not only does it seem influenced by Julio-Claudian dynastic practices as known to Pliny, but it is also contradicted by *Anth. Pal.* 16.336, which states Lysippos made a portrait of the youthful Alexander in his old age (Stewart 1990, 291). Similarly, the expression in *Stat. Silv.* 4.6.61, that the Herakles Epitrapezios kept Alexander company “alike in

East and West” (*comitem occasus secum portabat et ortus*) is generic and hardly grounds for the Theban inference, nor can 4.6.70 (*fertur Thebanos tantum excussasse triumphos*) be related to the previous section.

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., Todisco’s description of the Dresden Artemis attributed to Praxiteles (69, fig. 105), and contrast his evaluation of the Lansdowne Herakles (101–102, fig. 201) or that of the Antikythera Youth (102, fig. 202). Equally noncommittal or even faintly negative is Todisco’s evaluation of the Akanthos Column, whose unknown master is said to have “rather limited sensitivity” (138).

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., the caption to the Sorrento base, fig. 137, despite reference to Roccas 1989.

eloquent prose, and extensive, informed discussion, this volume will be consulted frequently and for some time to come. For the specialist, its bibliography alone would be essential, which commendably comprises both Italian and foreign titles, in contrast to the many publications that seem to consider only works in their own language or in the authoritative German. The introductory chapter, setting the stage for the monuments, is outstanding and comprehensive. Even the "faults," such as they are, are common to the majority of survey books on Greek sculpture, and therefore not specifically imputable to this particular author, who often tries to express original ideas and positions of his own.

#### SCULPTURE IN CONTEXT—THE SOCIO-HISTORICAL APPROACH

In its focus on masters and masterpieces, Todisco's book, although much more informed and better illustrated, is not far from Furtwängler's pioneering work—indeed, the German scholar is cited in several of its photographic captions. In its comprehensive acceptance of attributions and reliance on the ancient sources, the Italian volume continues the tradition of monographs on individual sculptors, such as the already cited trilogy by Corso on Praxiteles, the numerous publications by Moreno on Lysippos,<sup>13</sup> the books by Kreikenbom (1990) on Polykleitan types and by Palagia on Euphranor (1980). On the other hand, in his attempt to provide a sociocultural context for the works, Todisco is more in line with authors such as Stewart (1990, 1993a), Pollitt (1986), and Hurwit (1985).<sup>14</sup> Although much is being made today of this need to illuminate the context of a work of art, the notion is not new, and can be traced back to the ancient writers, who often equated political stability or freedom with creativity in the arts, and conversely saw the arts decline or even cease in moments of civic unrest. That this picture is patently wrong can be demonstrated by the splendid Athenian sculptural production during the dark

years of the Peloponnesian War and the plague, but the idea persisted in antiquity, and found its modern advocate in Johann Joachim Winckelmann, whose influence, albeit subconsciously, can still be felt in some of today's prejudices and biases about classical sculpture, for instance, that of the Hellenistic period.<sup>15</sup>

In a restricted sense, context can be taken as the impact of specific historical or political events on contemporary art, and this concept has been explored and even exploited for a long time. I need here recall only the many studies explaining the meaning of the Parthenon sculptures in relation to the events of the Persian War, Perikles' politics, and Athenian imperialism or, conversely, democracy.<sup>16</sup> For earlier phases, comparable debates have raged, for instance, over the message and chronology of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, and John Boardman has spearheaded a whole movement correlating historical figures with mythological iconography of the Archaic period. That such studies are of relative value is shown by the fact that the same monument can be viewed as the embodiment of diametrically opposite ideals or the same myth as referring to different personalities. Art historians are now becoming aware of the possibility that context does not necessarily translate into content, and that art has its own validity and message independent of contemporary events. This statement is doubly true with reference to Greek art, which was always strongly anchored to religion and used mythology as its primary message, regardless of other possible layers of meaning.<sup>17</sup>

Art historical theory on the value of context has reached a position of almost complete skepticism. Realizing that context, intended as the sum of all the circumstances that may come into play around a work of art, could be indefinitely extended, it has argued that therefore total context is impossible to establish. At the same time, it has seen the artistic creation as the product of outside forces, and has therefore tended to minimize the importance of the creator. Finally, it has warned that a reversal of the theoretical process is possible, and that "context used to determine content" may be turned into "content used to

<sup>13</sup> It is impossible to list here all the publications by Moreno on the Sikyonian master. Todisco's abbreviations (483) list 21 entries relevant to the subject, ranging from 1971 to 1991.

<sup>14</sup> I have tried to limit my bibliographical mentions to works of the last two decades, and to include work in progress or of forthcoming appearance (cited only in the notes, rather than in the bibliography), in order better to highlight current trends, but this selection should not be taken to imply that earlier publications are outmoded or superfluous. I have also given preference to authors writing in this country, but comparable efforts by scholars abroad should be mentioned: e.g., Marcadé 1969, Hölscher 1973 (and many other articles since), Giuliani 1986, Himmelmann 1990 (and his many other earlier works), and, most prominent and probably earliest among Italian archaeologists, Bianchi Bandinelli 1943. Finally, I have frequently cited my own publications, because they contain much more extensive references than are feasible to cite in the present article.

<sup>15</sup> An important article on Winckelmann and the ancient sources, by A.A. Donohue, will appear in the forthcoming publication of a symposium on Polykleitos (*Polykleitos, the Doryphoros and Tradition*) held at the University of Wisconsin in October 1989. The same scholar is currently writing a monograph on the historiography of ancient art.

<sup>16</sup> Such studies on the Parthenon have intensified in recent years because of the extensive conservation work being carried out on the Athenian Akropolis, with its concomitant discoveries; for a bibliographic update, see, e.g., Ridgway 1992.

<sup>17</sup> For discussion and bibliographical reference to Boardman's work and that of others along comparable lines, including M. Vickers and D. Francis, see Ridgway 1993, 8 and ns. 1.6 and 1.12 on pp. 16–17, as well as *passim*. For the primary religious message of Greek sculpture, see, e.g., Ridgway 1989a and 1991a. A strong case for context in connection with Roman portraiture has been made by Gazda and Haeckl 1993.

determine context."<sup>18</sup> This danger is particularly acute in the case of ancient sculpture, for which so little solid information exists. Indeed, Boardman has commented that modern preoccupations with the function of the sculptures within the society for which they were made "may themselves grow outdated once the limitations of our evidence are properly acknowledged rather than enthusiastically ignored."<sup>19</sup>

If art historical context means not simply creation, setting, patronage, but also other concomitant circumstances, archaeological context—as part of a discipline that physically unearths its own inventory—can be extended even further. It includes not only excavational findspots, obviously often different from initial settings,<sup>20</sup> but also, in the case of classical sculpture, the major issue of original versus copy, with all the nuanced intermediaries of adaptation, imitation, inspiration, and pastiche.<sup>21</sup> Setting, in such cases, must be determined in function not only of the purpose for which the original was made, but also of that for its copy, which may be separated in time by several centuries and involve basically different cultural needs. It is then that the circularity of the process of context versus content may become apparent, especially since the available ancient sources were usually written for entirely different reasons than to provide true art history. This realization has just begun to sink in, witness the more recent commentaries on Pliny and other literary references.<sup>22</sup> As for the historical events underlying certain monuments known only through *single* Roman sculptures, we are starting to see that we have tended to stress what we happen to know rather than what might have

been. Thus Pergamon has loomed large in all our sculptural interpretations because of its excavational presence and abundant information, to the detriment of possible Roman inspiration for the "copies" in Hellenistic style.<sup>23</sup> Even Greek originals, such as the so-called Pergamon Altar, have been dated more on presumed historical connections than on archaeological evidence, so that re-dating and reinvestigation are now in progress.<sup>24</sup>

The reverse process—trying to "see" known historical and political events reflected in the extant monuments—has yielded mixed results. The commemoration of 2,500 years of democracy was highlighted in this country by loan exhibitions from the Greek government and by symposia, both in the United States and in Athens, exploring the effects of political changes as witnessed in architecture and sculpture. The sculptural exhibition on *The Greek Miracle*, although vastly interesting for the specialist and greatly admired by the masses of visitors, attracted the justifiable barbs of art critics, not for the quality of its contents but for failing to fulfill its purported intent. In a more specialized vein, a session of the 1993 Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America ("The Archaeology of Athens and Attica in the Time of Cleisthenes") was devoted to papers exploring how the onset of democracy was traceable in Athenian architecture, institutions, and art. The concluding comments, by Michael Jameson, pointed out that the speakers, to some extent, had not proved the intended point, either by showing that civic progress had already been made under the tyrants (J. McK. Camp), or by demonstrating that later authors had taken as laws what had instead been practical

<sup>18</sup> Most of my comments are derived from the important article by Bal and Bryson 1991. See, in particular, 177 on the *perpetuum mobile* of context, and 180 on the "death of the author" (= artist). They point out that humanist art historians consider the author-function as "essentially sacramental," whereas modernist art historians eliminate "romantic suppositions concerning the creative" and "the baggage of mythified authorship . . . to describe the limiting conditions that make the myth of genius impossible."

<sup>19</sup> J. Boardman, "Romancing the Stone. A Review of A. Stewart's *Greek Sculpture*," in *The New York Times Book Review* (30 September 1990) 38.

<sup>20</sup> It is, perhaps, superfluous to reiterate in this *Journal* the importance attached to the scientific recovery of excavational context, and thus the need to curb illicit digging. The famous Porticello Head continues to be considered a portrait (albeit of a "philosopher" in quotation marks) and to be dated ca. 400 (e.g., Todisco 1993, 62 and fig. 88), although a chronology closer to the Parthenon frieze seems better to agree with the style of the head and the related fragments. Even the turn into the fourth century would not have been considered a plausible date, had the material not come from a datable wreck.

<sup>21</sup> On the various forms of copying, see, e.g., Ridgway 1984 and Bartman 1992, as well as further discussion below. Even beyond this issue, we are still unable to decide with certainty whether an ancient sculpture was physically executed in the Greek or in the Roman period. Judgments traditionally made on the basis of quality ("if it is of

superior workmanship, it must be Greek") are now being revised, subject to marble analysis or to technical investigation in the case of ancient bronzes with all their possibilities for piece-casting and overcasting. See *infra*.

<sup>22</sup> See, e.g., Donohue 1988; Isager 1991, and its review by A.A. Donohue in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 3.3 (1992) 192–97.

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., sculptures such as the Capitoline Trumpeter and the Ludovisi Gaul, at first considered Greek originals, then accepted as copies, but of Hellenistic Pergamene bronzes of the end of the third century B.C., and now challenged as possible Roman creations on grounds of content (the suicide motif, the victimization of women), iconography (physical appearance, type of trumpet), and size (lack of correlation with the bases on the Pergamene akropolis): Ridgway 1990, 284–304, with bibliography; J. Marszal, "The Composition of Attalos's Victory Monuments at Pergamon," *AJA* 95 (1991) 296 (abstract); "The Death of Decebalus and the Motif of Barbarian Suicide," *AJA* 98 (1994) 335 (abstract). Note also the continuing debate on the correct assessment of the Sperlonga sculptures, perhaps best summarized in two contrasting points of view: Andreae 1988 and Ridgway 1989b; but see also Himmelfmann 1991.

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., Rotroff 1990, a useful article in general for the chronology of Hellenistic sculpture based on pottery and terracottas from datable contexts. The German view on the dating of the Pergamon Altar appears as an appendix to B. Andreae ed., *Phrymakhos-Probleme* (Mainz 1990).

customs for the identification of citizens by demotic or by patronymic (S. Brenne). The paper most relevant for sculpture (I. Trianti) concerned the redating (to ca. 500 B.C.) and reinterpretation of the so-called Akropolis scribes, completed through the joining of *disiecta membra* and seen now as the secretaries of three new political bodies. Yet even this exciting discovery concerned religious more than civic arrangements.<sup>25</sup>

#### SEMIOTICS

Art historical theory on context is partly based on the theory of signs and sign-use. It can thus interpret the work of art itself as a text whose visual elements correspond to sentences or to their component parts. As the alphabetical (verbal) symbols stand for sounds and together they form words, which in turn create a discourse, so visual signs are symbolic of specific messages, which become incorporated into a work of art meant to address an audience capable of decoding them. This consideration is, of course, especially relevant for a society whose literacy was limited and thus had to rely heavily on visual icons. The difficulty for our studies lies in the fact that the keys to the ancient "codes" are largely lost to us, and that we therefore tend to interpret images in terms of our own experiences, far removed in time from those of the period when the artwork was created. As in deciphering an unknown script or language, a linguistic approach to ancient art demands that enough "texts" be available to study occurrences and correspondences; in addition, it is necessary to have a "translation" in a known language in

order to validate our tentative decipherment. In the case of classical art, we possess contemporary literary sources that may throw light on thoughts and customs of antiquity, yet even this information is limited by the chance of survival and the purposes of the ancient authors. As for the artworks themselves, sculpture has not survived in sufficient examples to provide many coherent original wholes. In fact, Stewart (1990, 32) could comment that semiotics had so far made little or no inroads into sculptural studies, in contrast with vase painting research.

This perception can now be slightly modified by current projects. A forthcoming book by Gloria Ferrari Pinney, although primarily focused on Attic vases, has implications for some sculptural categories, such as the Archaic kouroi.<sup>26</sup> Joan Reilly, one of her students, has investigated Attic gravestones with representations of women adorning themselves, reaching a novel, symbolic interpretation.<sup>27</sup> Both these studies have alerted us to the fact that what appear as depictions of everyday life may in fact be allusions to moral concepts or even to a heroic past whose reality may have been more relevant to the ancients than it seems to us. Certainly, gravestones, with the repetition of motifs proper to their class, offer good grounds for other comparable investigations. They have already been explained as exponents of status symbols during the Hellenistic period—the literate, well-educated man in the guise of the orator or the philosopher, and the wealthy woman surrounded by attendants and personal belongings, as they appear on the stelai from Old Smyrna—and new publications will facilitate further speculation.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Summaries of these presentations appear in *AJA* 98 (1994) 283–85. I understand that some of these papers had already been given as part of the "Democracy 2500 Project" at the symposium "The Archaeology of Democracy" held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens on 4–6 December 1992 (forthcoming as W.D.E. Coulson et al. eds., *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* [Oxbow Monographs 37, 1994]), with a follow-up in Washington, D.C., on 16–18 April 1993. For critical comments on the message of the exhibition "The Greek Miracle," see, e.g., R. Hughes, "Greeks Bearing Loans. The Masterpiece Road Show," *Time* 141.2 (11 January 1993) 48–49.

A comparable situation prompted the 1990 exhibition and symposium on "Lo stile severo in Sicilia. Dall'apogeo della tirannide alla prima democrazia," which resulted in an excellent catalogue with important introductory essays and in papers of forthcoming publication. Yet the effort to show that the change in style coincided with democracy did not succeed, in that many of the best monuments exhibited were due to tyrannical sponsorship. For the essay on stone sculpture, see De Miro 1990.

Although framed for a broader context, the comments by Whitney Davis (1990, 23–29) on "reading from style to history," and "reading from history to style" may be pertinent, including, in the second section, a discussion of semiotics.

For a more focused study primarily based on the evidence of statue bases and honorary practices, which even reserves consideration of the extant sculpture for a future work, see Höghammar 1993, but also the reviews by M.

Fullerton, *AJA* 98 (1994) 377–80.

<sup>26</sup> G. Ferrari Pinney, *Figures of Speech*, to be published by the University of Chicago Press. The author has already expressed some of her theories in public lectures in 1992 and 1993.

<sup>27</sup> J. Reilly, *The Imagery of Female Adornment on Ancient Athenian Grave Reliefs* (Diss. Bryn Mawr College 1992). An article on this subject is now in preparation, but the author has anticipated her conclusions in a paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the College Art Association in New York, February 1994. A focus on Attic gravestones is the subject of C. Dallas, "Syntax and Semantics of Figurative Art: A Formal Approach," in P. Reilly and S. Rahtz eds., *Archaeology and the Information Age: A Global Perspective* (New York 1992), which I know, however, solely through the mention by S.S. Lukesh in her review of the book, *AJA* 98 (1994) 356–57.

<sup>28</sup> The speculation on Hellenistic gravestones is by Zanker 1993, as presented at a Berkeley University symposium on the Hellenistic period in 1988. As that study was sparked by Pfuhl and Möbius 1977–1979, so perhaps new investigations will be promoted by the appearance of the major corpus in six volumes of text and one of plates, by C.W. Clairmont, *Classical Attic Tombstones* (Kilchberg 1993), meant to update and replace A. Conze, *Die attische Grabreliefs* (Berlin 1890–1922). Iconographic studies of Attic stelai by J. Bergemann and A. Scholl are also forthcoming.

Other serial sculpture, such as votive plaques and the so-called Record Reliefs, could also be subjected to comparable analyses. The former have been treated only in

Some semiotic vocabulary has also infiltrated archaeological publications, so that, for instance, the terms “signifier” and “referent” can now be found and understood within sculptural contexts. Visual narrative (as contrasted with icons), given its more obvious relationship to verbal techniques, has also proved fruitful ground for speculation. Beside the work by Richard Brilliant (1984) on Etruscan and Roman art, Andrew Stewart (1985) has made use of linguistics and literary criticism, adopting such expressions as syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations within a work of art, as if within a written text, to analyze the sculptural program of the Nike temple on the Akropolis and its parapet. He has continued in a similar vein in his more recent work on ancient narrative (1993b), by comparing the baroque (“Pergamene”) style to Asiatic rhetoric and the use made by both of metaphor and allusion. As Bal and Bryson warn us (1991, 270), “readers and viewers bring to the images their own cultural baggage,” and so art criticism may run the risk of being too clever and sophisticated, thus reading into the sculptures meanings and purposes well beyond what the evidence can sustain.<sup>29</sup>

#### ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND GENDER STUDIES

Although based on linguistic theory, Ferrari Pinney's and Reilly's research rests as well on anthropological tenets and benefits from the new trends in gender studies. These latter are a by-product of the feminist movement that has extended to an investigation and a reevaluation of the past, at least within Anglo-Saxon, perhaps primarily American, circles. Here again, vase painting has been better served—or at least, better investigated—than sculpture, although Natalie Kampen and Diana Kleiner have written important commentaries on images of Roman women, in funerary statuary and reliefs and on sarcophagi. A forthcoming book by Joan Connelly, on depictions of priestesses in Greek antiquity, will stress the position of women in festivals and rituals by considering the evidence of statue bases and monuments.<sup>30</sup> Another

investigation in progress, by Andrew Stewart, promises to focus on the conception of the female body as expressed by sculpture, from the rendering of costume, including diaphanous drapery, to outright nudity.

Many other studies, by declared feminists, have made primary use of ancient literature, with the occasional sculpture thrown in as exemplification of specific positions. Yet, as pointed out above in discussing context, there is an unavoidable tendency to interpret the past in the light of current experience; moreover, the Classical authors were not describing normal occurrences but writing tragedies with mythical heroines, or arguing trials with female offenders. In the United States in particular (as far as I, a Mediterranean woman, can judge), there seems to be a built-in assumption that equates power and prestige with the right to vote and prominence in political life, yet these were not priorities in an ancient woman's life. The balance may now begin to swing in the opposite direction, or at least to regain a middle ground, with studies focusing on the more official, often religious, evidence provided by sculpture, and specifically on Amazons seen not as victims but as lower-key duplications of the goddess Athena, and on women as sponsors of civic works and art.<sup>31</sup>

Anthropology has not only promoted gender studies, but has also emphasized the importance of transition rituals. A great deal of attention has therefore been devoted to rites of passage, whether for men or women, as markers of transformation from childhood into maturity and—for men—citizenship, and the rituals around marriage and death. A spate of publications on funerary customs is now being balanced by others on initiation rites for both genders. Although these concerns are more usually directed to the prehistoric phases of Greek culture, some focus on the classical. Studies on ritual haircuts have thrown new light on sculptural depictions, and marriage rites have been used to explain the Lokroi pinakes, for instance, or other sculptural monuments. Nudity in Greek male statuary has also been explored from the point of view of initiation.<sup>32</sup>

general (e.g., Neumann 1979) or in fragmented fashion, by recipient (e.g., Tagalidou 1993); the latter have been gathered by Meyer 1989, but another work on the same topic, by C. Lawton, is forthcoming.

<sup>29</sup> A well-written exegesis may then become a self-sufficient work of art in its own right, like the epigrams of the *Anthologia Palatina* or the Latin poems in praise of ancient masterpieces. How dangerous some interpretations may be is demonstrated by Stewart 1993b, esp. 173–74 n. 16, which also shows how a chronological shift of only one or two decades can affect the political allusions of the Pergamon “Altar.”

An essay by Hölscher (1987), on Roman sculpture, derives its theoretical framework from semantics, and uses Greek sculptures as comparisons and contrasts to the Roman usage and meaning of Classical forms and types.

<sup>30</sup> Kampen 1981; Kleiner 1977, 1987, and, to some extent, her major book on Roman sculpture, 1992. Connelly's book, *Women and Ritual: Priestesses in Greek Art and Society*, will be published by Cambridge University Press. An earlier publication, Mantis 1990, although concerned with both men and women, is primarily devoted to scul-

ture. An extensive literature on gender studies, albeit with emphasis on prehistoric times, is given by J.B. Rutter in his “Review of Aegean Prehistory II,” *AJA* 97 (1993) 758 n. 44. See also Bacus et al. 1993.

<sup>31</sup> See, e.g., M.Y. Goldberg, “The Amazon Myth and Gender Studies,” *AJA* 98 (1994) 334–35 (abstract), in anticipation of her monograph on Amazons. For an all too cursory review of women and the arts, see Ridgway 1987. Connelly's new interpretation of the Parthenon frieze, “The Parthenon Frieze and the Sacrifice of the Erechtheids: Reinterpreting the Peplos Scene,” *AJA* 97 (1993) 309–10 (abstract), would also give considerably more importance to the role of Athenian women in civic life than hitherto supposed.

<sup>32</sup> On ritual haircuts, see, e.g., Harrison 1988a; on the Lokroi pinakes, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1978. On nudity, see, e.g., Bonfante 1989, with bibliography, and Ferrari Pinney (supra n. 26), forthcoming. Note also the many publications by Sourvinou-Inwood (e.g., 1988, 1991), and by Kahil (e.g., 1981) in connection with the cult of Brauronian Artemis.



Religion is playing an ever increasing role in our understanding of ancient art, as attested by the symposia held periodically by the Swedish Institute at Athens. Mythology is as ever at the iconographic forefront, now through the invaluable aid of the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, which is approaching completion. The danger here is that mythological depictions are sometimes taken as proof of cult activities, in a somewhat circular argument. But certainly the extensive analysis of changing depictions of the same myth (or divine image) has yielded fruitful theories not only on the narrative techniques of ancient art but also on the varying interests and beliefs of different periods.<sup>33</sup>

#### ACHIEVEMENTS

Aside from these theoretical currents, publications on sculpture have focused on other aspects of the discipline. Perhaps the most important step forward, in my opinion, is our increased understanding of the so-called Roman copies. Although earlier authors had tried to see them as products of their Roman environment, the emphasis had consistently been on the alleged Greek prototypes. Now this emphasis has shifted, and the most important questions being asked are not about what was being copied but why and how. An important book by Elizabeth Bartman (1992) considers copies at reduced scale and prefaces three case studies with penetrating comments on the whole copying industry and process. Roman motivations for obtaining replicas of Greek works were explored by Marvin (1989) at a 1985 symposium at the National Gallery of Art,<sup>34</sup> and have been the subject of several German studies. In particular, it has been pointed out that certain Roman works derive general, rather than specific, inspiration from Greek iconography, and therefore go back to a Grundtypus that allows endless variations within a specific group (Landwehr 1990, Kranz 1989). Still among the desiderata is the establishment of a corpus of Roman statuary in the round seen as Roman creations, even if echoing Greek styles.

The same approach is being applied, although more sporadically, to the study of two-dimensional sculpture, especially the so-called Neo-Attic reliefs. Long considered

a purely decorative reproduction of Classical prototypes, these works are now being assessed within the same spectrum of interpretation, imitation, and emulation, as the "copies" in the round. It stands to reason that if workshops of the Roman period were capable of this creative range for statuary, they could also exploit it for reliefs, often drawing their inspiration not simply from stone models, but also from engraved bronzes and vase paintings.<sup>35</sup>

In line with these conceptions is the understanding that "revival" styles are not limited to the well-established sets of Archaic-Archaistic and Classical-Classicizing. We now can add Severe-Severizing, and, although no new term has been coined for it, we acknowledge the existence of Roman "Hellenistic." In particular, it is now better understood that revival (i.e., Roman-period) styles, like literary genres or poetic meters, could be chosen to depict specific subjects: Archaistic to denote great antiquity, Severizing for mythological beings or events, Classicizing for divine images, Hellenistic for epic narrative.<sup>36</sup> Mixtures of styles were also possible, according to current taste or intended setting.

In terms of the evolution of Greek style itself, it is now convincingly argued that the linear development traditionally advocated for Greek sculpture on theoretical grounds may not have corresponded to reality.<sup>37</sup> More than one trend could coexist at any time even in Classical times, but this is especially true of the Hellenistic period, with its many influences. Pre-Pergamene baroque with roots in the fourth century is now an accepted fact, as is the presence in that same (still Classical) period of the Classicizing phenomenon not limited to the second-first centuries B.C.<sup>38</sup>

The traditional assumption that styles spread throughout the Greek world at a more or less even pace has also undergone revision. Beyond the recognition of a "Lingering Archaic" style not to be considered strictly Archaistic or Archaizing, there is also the awareness that the Classical or the mid-to-late fifth century promoted by Athens did not spark similar developments elsewhere until the following century. It has been suggested that this was not so much because of preference for the Severe style, but primarily because the great building activity that quick-

<sup>33</sup> See, e.g., L.E. Roller's review of the otherwise significant Shapiro 1989, in *AJA* 95 (1991) 352. On the connection between myth and cult, see also Calame 1990. An example of the changing images of Athena on the Athenian Akropolis can be found in Ridgway 1992.

<sup>34</sup> Miranda Marvin and Elaine K. Gazda recently offered an NEH Summer Seminar at the American Academy in Rome (6 June–22 July 1994) on "The Roman Art of Emulation," which specifically addressed this phenomenon: see the outline of the course in *AJA* 98.1 (1994) in the announcements section after p. 188.

<sup>35</sup> For the use of *interpretatio*, *imitatio*, and *aemulatio*, as applied to Roman copies, see, e.g., Ridgway 1984, ch. 7, with bibliography. The same principles applied to Neo-Attic reliefs: besides my early efforts (Ridgway 1970, ch. 8), new ground is being covered by M. Fullerton in a forthcoming study. He has anticipated some of his thinking in

a paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the College Art Association in February 1994.

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g., Archaistic, Severizing, Classicizing, and Hellenistic/Roman sculptures as discussed by Fuchs 1992, with bibliography. See also M.D. Fullerton's review of Fuchs, *AJA* 98 (1994) 378–80. Important comments on Roman Hellenistic can be found in Weis 1992, esp. ch. 4, "Hellenistic Style and Narrative in the Silver Age"; see also her ch. 5, "Patterns of Popularity and Copy Design."

<sup>37</sup> See, e.g., the forthcoming book on the Aphrodite of Knidos, by C.M. Havelock, to be published by the University of Michigan Press.

<sup>38</sup> For pre-Pergamene baroque, see, e.g., Pollitt 1986, 111–12; for Classicizing in the fourth century, e.g., Roccas 1986, 16–26, and 1991; in more general terms, also Marcadé 1988.

ened the pace of sculptural development in Attica did not correspond to similar construction elsewhere. Only when new structures needed to be erected in the Peloponnesos and in Asia Minor, even in Italy, were the new stylistic forms carried there by itinerant masters or even by pattern books, so that a virtual, albeit apparent, gap may exist between Severe and fourth-century styles outside Athens.<sup>39</sup> That styles may change largely because of increased demand and production, or other local circumstances, rather than solely on theoretical grounds or because of the impulse of genius, is a new conception that may need to be considered.

The consequences of such an approach are twofold. On the one hand, regional studies may receive greater impetus—witness the 1992 symposium on sculpture from Arkadia and Lakonia edited by Palagia and Coulson (1993), or the forthcoming exhibition of Magna Graecian sculpture at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. On the other hand, even the contributions of the great masters should be reassessed in more realistic and critical terms. A current project distributed among several authors has the potential to provide just the type of penetrating and discriminating essays we need, based on hard evidence more than on speculation.<sup>40</sup> The same desideratum may be formulated for the field of portraiture, which has suffered from the same attributionism prevalent in the study of masters, but which may now see progress in a different direction.

As strong as the desire to recover the *opera nobilia* is the urge to recognize famous Greek personages in the portraits that have come down to us in busts and statues of the Roman period. This understandable wish has resulted in inflated categories, especially for the portraiture of Alexander the Great, where every youthful head with tousled locks has been considered an image of the famous Macedonian. In recent years, a minimalist reaction has set in, and a more discriminating approach is producing better results. Although traditional studies have continued, criticism and doubts are now often expressed. That we

are still unable to distinguish with confidence the portrait of a Greek from that of a Roman is disturbing, but an emphasis on intended political messages and a more scrupulous use of numismatic evidence (entire series of coins, rather than sporadic examples singled out to prove a specific, idiosyncratic identification) promise sounder results.<sup>41</sup> This revival of interest in Hellenistic rulers finds a—perhaps unintentional—counterpart in increased attention to Hellenistic sculpture.

Long considered a quagmire because of the relative lack of ancient literary references, its vague chronological and ideological framework, its complex historical background, and our innate prejudice inherited from the Romans, the study of Hellenistic art is receiving new impetus from several modern historical surveys and a more intelligent analysis of the visual material. Here too, stricter definition of what constitutes a Hellenistic original or a later creation in Hellenistic style is essential for our understanding and appreciation of this long and multifaceted phase.<sup>42</sup> Important advances made in studying techniques and materials may strongly contribute to such an undertaking.

This is a field where great progress has indeed been achieved. The creation of an Association for the Study of Marbles and Other Stones In Antiquity (ASMOSIA), with its *Newsletter* circulating since 1988, has promoted rapid diffusion of information, both on bibliography and on congresses or symposia on relevant subjects. Although analysis, by various scientific means, has not yet reached total accuracy or complete identification of quarries, because of still insufficient data on ancient stone sources, many steps forward have been made and are changing, as well as expanding, our understanding of marble trade in the Greek and Roman world. Analysis of quarrying methods and techniques has also allowed increased speculation on foreign influences on the origins of Greek sculpture: not simply those, long acknowledged, from Egypt, but also from Anatolia and the Near East, in keeping with recent trends that highlight interconnections

<sup>39</sup> For Archaistic/Archaizing and their definition, see Fullerton 1990, and Ridgway 1993, 445–46 with bibliography on 462–63. Building activity important for the development from Archaic into Severe: Ridgway 1985. For the persistence of earlier trends during the stylistic developments in fifth-century Attica, see my forthcoming paper, “Lo stile severo. Lo stato della questione,” as given at the Symposium on the Severe Style, Palermo, February 1990.

<sup>40</sup> This collection of articles, edited by J.J. Pollitt and O. Palagia, will be published in *YCS*. To be sure, the best studies on single masters stem from the existence of proven originals by their hands, as Despinis 1971 for Agorakritos. Current excavations at Messene promise to shed new light on the Hellenistic sculptures by Damophon and his sons.

<sup>41</sup> For the portraiture of Alexander, see, e.g., Stewart 1993a, esp. 56–70, for a review of previous approaches and examination of principles. Stewart 1979 is also innovative in its method. The political approach to identification is perhaps most recently exemplified by Smith 1988,

and the more rigorous use of numismatic evidence by Fleischer 1991, esp. 2; cf. also his more concise presentation (Fleischer 1990).

<sup>42</sup> Historical surveys: see, e.g., Green 1990, Gruen 1984. For an overly comprehensive approach, based partly on literary parallels, see, e.g., Fowler 1989, and its review by J.J. Pollitt, *AJA* 95 (1991) 176–77. Most of the “fixed points” of Hellenistic sculptural chronology enumerated by Andrae (1989) seem to me questionable. For a more skeptical approach, see Ridgway 1990. Renewed interest in Hellenistic art is evidenced, e.g., by the fact that the latest International Congress of Classical Archaeology, held in Berlin in 1988, was devoted to the Hellenistic period; the papers have been published in *Akten des XIII. internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie 1988* (Mainz 1990). See also Reeder 1988, and its introductory essays.

One area that has attracted great interest in recent years because of major archaeological finds—Macedonia—has yet to make an impact on sculptural studies.

throughout the Mediterranean basin and the ancient world.<sup>43</sup> Scientific results are, however, subject to the same strictures of interpretation as other archaeological evidence—witness the 1992 symposium on the authenticity of the Getty Kouros (*Getty Kouros* 1993), where consensus could not be reached on either grounds. Yet the help provided by the laboratory should not be discounted or underestimated.

Equally important is the observation of technical details, whether in bronze casting or marble carving. Several recent studies (Palagia 1987, Mattusch 1988, Rockwell 1989, Pfanner 1989, *Marble* 1990) have already proved significant for chronological and artistic assessment, and others are planned. The use of infrared lighting, and even close observation in favorable lighting conditions, have revealed on stone traces of paint that have considerably changed or increased our understanding of the sculptures.<sup>44</sup> Mattusch's second book, on fourth-century and Hellenistic bronzes, is in progress, and promises to shed new light on the serial making of large bronzes from single models; this process would have not only expedited the execution of multifigured groups, but also perpetuated the use of certain stylistic forms well beyond the date of the prototype, with significant consequences for our understanding of style. Even the evidence at our disposal is increasing. Particular mention should here be made of the official publication of the Baiae casts (Landwehr 1985), and of the 1992 underwater discovery of as many as 250 items from large-scale statues in the harbor of Brindisi (ancient Brundisium, Italy), which are bound to virtually double the amount of extant bronze statuary available for analysis.<sup>45</sup> Periodic international congresses on bronze casting have been held at various locations and their proceedings published with regularity;<sup>46</sup> a future one is planned for Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1996. A symposium on the Mahdia shipwreck, to take place in Bonn in 1994, will also expand our views on commercial production of artifacts in the late Hellenistic/early Roman period. Undoubtedly, underwater archaeology, so important for its prehistoric finds, has contributed much also to classical sculpture, and will continue to do so.

Technology has also helped in other ways, although not limited to sculptural studies. Computer-aided statistics can be applied, for instance, to the distribution of copies and calculations of sizes or arrangement of fragments. In England, under the sponsorship of King's College, London, a video data base of text and images called DAEDALUS is gathering all textual, epigraphical, and material evidence relating to the life, works, and style of all known

Greek sculptors for the period from ca. 650 to 30 B.C., drawing its photographic documentation largely from the extensive Ashmole Archive. In this country, a comparable project, PERSEUS, sponsored by Harvard University, although ampler in its archaeological coverage, provides concise information on some ancient statuary as well, together with illustrations, often in more than one view, in a visual range and with cross-referencing impossible for standard publications. Even books, their writing and their editing, have been expedited by the computer, so that now information and bibliography can be kept as up-to-date as a matter of months. Technical advances in the future promise even better visual documentation, such as remote imaging, and greater facility in storage and retrieval of information.

In terms of publications, there will always be the need for superb photographs and large plates, but a recent trend has been the appearance of paperbacks on Greek sculpture (as on vase painting) supplied with many, albeit small, illustrations accompanied by a concise but scholarly text (e.g., Boardman 1978, 1985, Smith 1991).<sup>47</sup> At the other extreme, museums and other sculptural collections continue to be published in voluminous catalogues with extensive bibliography: note, for instance, the German series on the Munich Glyptothek and the Villa Albani in Rome, or the first volume in the long-awaited French publication of the Greek material in the Louvre (Hamiaux 1992). Of the ambitious *Handbuch der Archäologie*, intended to replace G. Lippold, *Die griechische Plastik* (Munich 1950), only the first volume, on Geometric and Archaic sculpture, has appeared (Floren 1987). Specialized, problem-oriented studies continue to be published on both sides of the Atlantic, but they seem to reach only few archaeologists, and perhaps even fewer classicists and general art historians.

Major essays and articles on classical sculpture are often also embedded in volumes in honor of individual scholars (e.g., the festschrifts for J. Inan, N. Himmelmann, and E. Simon), acts of international congresses, or exhibition catalogues. In this last context, special mention should be made of a specific kind of loan exhibition organized by American museums (notably that of Emory University, where Maxwell Anderson has pioneered), that focuses not on famous masterpieces but on little-known objects usually kept in European storerooms and thus largely ignored. The resultant catalogues rely heavily on the accompanying essays, which offer the opportunity of breaking new theoretical ground or highlighting new research directions. Given the risk of including (and study-

<sup>43</sup> For Anatolian influences on Greek quarrying methods, see, e.g., M. Waelkens, P. de Paepe, and L. Moens, in *Marble* 1990, 47–72. For more theoretical grounds on interconnections, see Morris 1992; a forthcoming book by J. B. Carter, on the beginning of Greek sculpture on Crete, through North Syrian influences, will be published by Yale University Press.

<sup>44</sup> See, e.g., the major consequences of the recognition of paint on the Isthmia perirrhanterion (Sturgeon 1987, 41–45), and of the painted labels on the Siphnian Treasury friezes (Brinckmann 1985). Cf. also Harrison 1988b.

<sup>45</sup> For a preliminary listing of the Brindisi finds, see the special publication by the Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, of a *Bollettino di Archeologia: VIII settimana per i beni culturali e ambientali: Bronzi di Punta del Serrone* (Rome 1992) 3–16.

<sup>46</sup> These proceedings and relevant publications on bronze casting are annually reviewed by C. Rolley in successive issues of *RA*, beginning in 1983.

<sup>47</sup> I understand that J. Boardman is currently writing another book in the same format on the fourth century B.C.

ing) clever fakes whenever private collections are displayed, these exchange exhibitions of proven archaeological finds are to be applauded.

To keep track of all that appears within the discipline, or even to read the amount of material being produced, has become increasingly difficult.

#### PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

These closing comments obviously represent my own wishes for the discipline, based on my personal understanding of it, but they are in part derived from the trends and practices outlined above and from the current direction of our studies.

First and foremost, it is hoped that the study of sculpture will take its legitimate place among the various fields of archaeological endeavor. This position, to my mind, is different from the aesthetic preeminence given to it at the time of Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke*, when archaeology was still struggling to define itself as a science rather than as a purely humanistic endeavor. Insofar as classical archaeology is both a discipline and a technique—the material recovery of the record of the past from the earth and the sea—it incorporates features of different specializations and it employs different research strategies, but they are all aimed at reconstructing classical culture, and none should be considered alien to it as long as it serves the final goal. Abandoning the romantic visions of the Golden Age that affected 18th- and 19th-century scholars,<sup>48</sup> understanding the historical reasons for preferences and prejudices, making judicious use of the ancient sources within their limitations, the study of sculpture could contribute greatly to the archaeological purpose, or at least as greatly as the study of pottery, architectural remains, and inscriptions—all of which are based, to some extent, on stylistic judgments of development of forms. We should cease to expect scientific accuracy from material analyses, since our finds are inevitably determined by the double chances of survival and recovery. We can certainly aim for ever greater accuracy in such recovery, but we shall never be able to control the rate of survival, dependent on the vicissitudes of the past. In this light, sculpture can take its rightful place among the other archaeological fields, as an invaluable documentation of aspects of the past that would otherwise be irrevocably lost. In its official capacity engendered by its permanence and public display, as expression of the religious and political beliefs of the classical world, sculpture constitutes a text unparalleled by any of the literary sources. It is up to us to read it closely and accurately.

Among the currents analyzed above, little or no attention was paid to formal analysis in sculptural studies. Yet even this trend continues apace, as indeed it should—not, however, as the self-fulfilling task of classification and dating that in its subjectivity and inaccuracy has given the discipline its dubious reputation, but rather as the effort

to place the object in its proper cultural context, so that it may serve as a true indicator of its time. Connoisseurship, not as an end in itself but as a means to a goal, will never be replaced. It must, however, be focused on the object itself, seen in its reality and not as a reflection of a presumed Greek prototype or as an illustration to a mention in an ancient source. Rhys Carpenter, one of the greatest formalists in American scholarship, used to urge his students to “let the objects speak for themselves,” to look first and foremost, without being brainwashed by previous theories or scholarly pronouncements. Theoretical movements, such as structuralism, semiotics, and feminism, can all contribute to our understanding as long as we do not let the theory dominate or even replace close and direct observation. Computers and laboratories should be seen as invaluable aids, but not as total substitutes for the eye and the touch.

Once the object has been seen and appraised, as far as possible, in its actuality and function, it is imperative that we ask all the basic questions of context, message, and inspiration that give each sculpture its validity as archaeological evidence. The difficult task ahead is to strike a balance between aesthetic appreciation and factual analysis, between wishful attributionism and realistic assessment. It will be necessary to abandon previously cherished tenets in the realization that the premises on which they were based are no longer valid,<sup>49</sup> yet we need not reach a position of total skepticism and agnosticism. But we also must distinguish between fact and theory, between confirmed knowledge and hypothetical reconstruction. In addition, we must overcome our ingrained Athenocentrism, which judges every sculptural manifestation by Attic standards and therefore finds every other regional expression not simply different but wanting and provincial. It is certainly hard to review all that we had been taught and taken for granted, but the very contradictions inherent in the “attribution game” show that not all is well with our present understanding.

After 100 years of studying classical sculpture, we may seem to have progressed very little beyond Furtwängler's vision and approach—we certainly no longer hope individually to achieve the complete mastery of all aspects of ancient art (from statuary to painting to gems to coins) that the German scholar possessed. But many new finds have come to enrich our inventory, and many new vistas have opened up to our investigation of the past. This is an exciting time for the student willing to ask new questions; even if each generation will provide different answers, they should all bring us closer to a global understanding of the classical past.

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

<sup>48</sup> Important, in this respect, is the study by Himmelmann 1981, with the penetrating preface by S. Settis.

<sup>49</sup> In this vein, see the comments by Bruneau 1993 to Hartswick 1990.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreae 1988: B. Andreae, *Laokoon und die Gründung Roms* (Mainz 1988).
- Andreae 1989: B. Andreae, "Fixpunkte hellenistischer Chronologie," in H.-U. Cain et al. eds., *Festschrift für Nikolaus Himmelmann* (BjB Beiheft 47, Mainz 1989) 237–44.
- Bacus et al. 1993: E.A. Bacus et al. eds., *A Gendered Past: A Critical Bibliography of Gender in Archaeology* (University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology Technical Report 25, Ann Arbor 1993).
- Bal and Bryson 1991: M. Bal and N. Bryson, "Semiotics and Art History," *ArtB* 73 (1991) 174–208.
- Bartman 1992: E. Bartman, *Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 19, Leiden 1992).
- Bianchi Bandinelli 1943: R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Storicità dell'arte classica* (Florence 1943).
- Boardman 1978: J. Boardman, *Greek Sculpture: The Archaic Period* (London 1978).
- Boardman 1985: J. Boardman, *Greek Sculpture: The Classical Period* (London 1985).
- Bonfante 1989: L. Bonfante, "Nudity as Costume in Classical Art," *AJA* 93 (1989) 543–70.
- Brilliant 1984: R. Brilliant, *Visual Narratives. Storytelling in Etruscan and Roman Art* (Ithaca 1984).
- Brinckmann 1985: V. Brinckmann, "Die aufgemalten Namenbeinschriften an Nord- und Ostfries des Siphnierschatzhauses," *BCH* 109 (1985) 77–130.
- Bruneau 1993: P. Bruneau, "Le rajeunissement de l'Arès Borghèse," *BCH* 117 (1993) 401–405.
- Calame 1990: C. Calame, *Thésée et l'imaginaire athénien* (Lausanne 1990).
- Corso 1988: A. Corso, *Prassiteles: Fonti epigrafiche e letterarie, Vita e opere 1. Le iscrizioni e le fonti letterarie fino al medio impero compreso (IV secolo a.C.–175 d.C. circa)* (Quaderno di Xenia 10, Rome 1988).
- Corso 1990: A. Corso, *Prassiteles: Fonti epigrafiche e letterarie, Vita e opere 2. Fonti letterarie tardoantiche (circa 175 d.C.–470)* (Quaderno di Xenia 10, Rome 1990).
- Corso 1992: A. Corso, *Prassiteles: Fonti epigrafiche e letterarie, Vita e opere 3. Fonti letterarie bizantine (ca. 470–XIII secolo)* (Quaderno di Xenia 10, Rome 1992).
- Davis 1990: W. Davis, "Style and History in Art History," in M.W. Conkey and C.A. Hastorf eds., *The Uses of Style in Archaeology* (Cambridge 1990) 18–31.
- De Miro 1990: E. De Miro, "La scultura in pietra," in *Lo stile severo in Sicilia. Dall'apogeo della tirannide alla prima democrazia* (Palermo 1990) 107–16.
- Despinis 1971: G.I. Despinis, *Σύμβολη στη μελέτη του έργου του Αγορακρίτου* (Athens 1971).
- Donohue 1988: A.A. Donohue, *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture* (Atlanta 1988).
- Fleischer 1990: R. Fleischer, "Physiognomie, Ideologie, dynastische Politik: Porträts seleukidischer Könige," in *Akten des XIII. internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie 1988* (Mainz 1990) 33–36.
- Fleischer 1991: R. Fleischer, *Studien zur seleukidischen Kunst 1. Herrscherbildnisse* (Mainz 1991).
- Floren 1987: J. Floren, *Die geometrische und archaische Plastik. Die griechische Plastik 1* (HdA, Munich 1987).
- Fowler 1989: B.H. Fowler, *The Hellenistic Aesthetic* (Madison 1989).
- Fuchs 1992: M. Fuchs, *Römische Idealplastik (Glyptothek München, Katalog der Skulpturen 6*, Munich 1992).
- Fullerton 1990: M.D. Fullerton, *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 110, Leiden 1990).
- Gazda and Haeckl 1993: E.K. Gazda and A.E. Haeckl, "Roman Portraiture: Reflections on the Question of Context," *JRA* 6 (1993) 289–302.
- Getty Kouros 1993: *The Getty Kouros Colloquium* (Athens 1993).
- Giuliani 1986: L. Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* (Frankfurt 1986).
- Green 1990: P. Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley 1990).
- Gruen 1984: E. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley 1984).
- Hamiaux 1992: M. Hamiaux, *Les sculptures grecques. Des origines à la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> s. a. J.-C.* (Musée du Louvre, Département des antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Catalogue 1, Paris 1992).
- Harrison 1988a: E.B. Harrison, "Greek Sculptured Coiffures and Ritual Haircuts," in R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, and G.C. Nordquist eds., *Early Greek Cult Practice* (Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26–29 June 1986; Stockholm 1988) 247–54.
- Harrison 1988b: E.B. Harrison, "'Theseum' East Frieze: Color Traces and Attachment Cuttings," *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 339–49.
- Hartswick 1990: K.J. Hartswick, "The Ares Borghese Reconsidered," *RA* 1990, 227–83.
- Himmelmann 1981: N. Himmelmann, *Utopia del passato* (translation from the original German *Utopische Vergangenheit, Archäologie und moderne Kultur*, Berlin 1976) with preface by S. Settis (Bari 1981).
- Himmelmann 1990: N. Himmelmann, *Ideal Nacktheit in der griechischen Kunst* (Berlin 1990).
- Himmelmann 1991: N. Himmelmann, "Laokoon," *AntK* 34 (1991) 97–115.
- Höghammar 1993: K. Höghammar, *Sculpture and Society. A Study of the Connection between the Free-standing Sculpture and Society on Kos in the Hellenistic and Augustan Periods* (Boreas 23, Uppsala 1993).
- Hölscher 1973: T. Hölscher, *Griechische Historienbilder des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Würzburg 1973).
- Hölscher 1987: T. Hölscher, *Römische Bildsprache als semantisches System* (AbhHeid 1987).
- Hurwit 1985: J.M. Hurwit, *The Art and Culture of Early Greece, 1100–480 B.C.* (Ithaca 1985).
- Isager 1991: J. Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society. The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art* (Odense University Classical Studies 17, Odense 1991).
- Kahil 1981: L. Kahil, "Le 'cratérisque' d'Artémis et le Brauronion de l'Acropole," *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 253–63.

- Kampen 1981: N.B. Kampen, *Image and Status. Roman Working Women in Ostia* (Berlin 1981).
- Kleiner 1977: D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture. The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* (New York 1977).
- Kleiner 1987: D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Imperial Funerary Altars with Portraits* (Rome 1987).
- Kleiner 1992: D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven 1992).
- Kranz 1989: P. Kranz, "Die Asklepiosstatue in Schlosspark von Klein-Glienicke. Ein neuer Typus und sein kulturgeschichtlicher Hintergrund," *JdI* 104 (1989) 107–55, esp. 126–27.
- Kreikenbom 1990: D. Kreikenbom, *Bildwerke nach Polyklet, Kopienkritische Untersuchungen zu den männlichen statuarischen Typen nach polykletischen Vorbildern* (Berlin 1990).
- Landwehr 1985: C. Landwehr, *Die antiken Gipsabgüsse aus Baiae. Griechische Bronzestatuen in Abgüsse römischer Zeit* (Berlin 1985).
- Landwehr 1990: C. Landwehr, "Die Sitzstatue eines bärtigen Gottes in Charchel. Zur Originalität römischer Vatergottdarstellungen," in B. Andreae ed., *Phrymachos-Probleme* (Mainz 1990) 101–22.
- Mantis 1990: A.G. Mantis, *Προβλήματα της εικονογραφίας των ιερείων και των ιερέων στην αρχαία ελληνική τέχνη* (Athens 1990).
- Marble 1990: *Marble. Art-historical and Scientific Perspectives on Ancient Sculpture* (Symposium held at the J. Paul Getty Museum on 28–30 April 1988; Malibu 1990).
- Marcadé 1969: J. Marcadé, *Au Musée de Delos* (Paris 1969).
- Marcadé 1988: J. Marcadé, "Le classicisme dans la sculpture grecque du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Πρακτικά του XII Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας* (Athens 1988) vol. 3, 185–86.
- Marvin 1989: M. Marvin, "Copying in Roman Sculpture: The Replica Series," in *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions* (Studies in the History of Art 20, Washington, D.C. 1989) 29–45.
- Mattusch 1988: C.C. Mattusch, *Greek Bronze Statuary. From the Beginning through the Fifth Century B.C.* (Ithaca 1988).
- Meyer 1989: M. Meyer, *Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs* (AM-BH 13, Berlin 1989).
- Morris 1992: S. Morris, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton 1992).
- Neumann 1979: G. Neumann, *Probleme des griechischen Weihreliefs* (Tübingen 1979).
- Palagia 1980: O. Palagia, *Euphranor* (Leiden 1980).
- Palagia 1987: O. Palagia, "Les techniques de la sculpture grecque sur marbre," in *Marbres helléniques. De la carrière au chef-d'oeuvre* (Brussels 1987) 76–89.
- Palagia and Coulson 1993: O. Palagia and W. Coulson eds., *Sculpture from Arcadia and Laconia* (Symposium held 10–14 April 1992 at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens; Oxbow Monograph 30, Oxford 1993).
- Pfanner 1989: M. Pfanner, "Über des Herstellen von Porträts. Ein Beitrag zu Rationalisierungsmassnahmen und Produktionsmechanismen von Massenware im späten Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit," *JdI* 104 (1989) 158–257.
- Pfuhl and Möbius 1977–1979: E. Pfuhl and H. Möbius, *Die ostgriechischen Grabreliefs* (Mainz 1977–1979).
- Pollitt 1986: J.J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge 1986).
- Reeder 1988: E.W. Reeder, *Hellenistic Art in the Walters Art Gallery* (Baltimore 1988).
- Ridgway 1970: B.S. Ridgway, *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture* (Princeton 1970).
- Ridgway 1982: B.S. Ridgway, "The Study of Ancient Sculpture," *AJA* 86 (1982) 155–57.
- Ridgway 1984: B.S. Ridgway, *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals* (Ann Arbor 1984).
- Ridgway 1985: B.S. Ridgway, "Late Archaic Sculpture," in C.G. Boulter ed., *Greek Art. Archaic into Classical. A Symposium Held at the University of Cincinnati, April 2–3, 1982* (Leiden 1985) 3–17.
- Ridgway 1986: B.S. Ridgway, "The State of Research on Ancient Art," *ArtB* 68 (1986) 7–23.
- Ridgway 1987: B.S. Ridgway, "Ancient Greek Women and Art: The Material Evidence," *AJA* 91 (1987) 399–409.
- Ridgway 1989a: B.S. Ridgway, "Parthenon and Parthenos," in N. Basgelen and M. Lugal eds., *Festschrift für Jale Inan* (Istanbul 1989 [1991]) 295–305.
- Ridgway 1989b: B.S. Ridgway, "Laokoon and the Foundation of Rome," *JRA* 2 (1989) 171–81.
- Ridgway 1990: B.S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture 1: The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.* (Madison 1990).
- Ridgway 1991a: B.S. Ridgway, "Archaic Architectural Sculpture and Travel Myths," *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 17 (1991) 95–112.
- Ridgway 1991b: B.S. Ridgway, *Greek Sculpture as Archaeological Evidence* (The Reverend Edward W. Bodnar, S.J., Inaugural Lecture, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 1991).
- Ridgway 1992: B.S. Ridgway, "Images of Athena on the Akropolis," in J. Neils, *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Hanover, N.H. 1992) 119–42, 210–15.
- Ridgway 1993: B.S. Ridgway, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*<sup>2</sup> (Chicago 1993).
- Roccos 1986: L.J. Roccos, *The Shoulder-pinned Back Mantle in Greek and Roman Sculpture* (Diss. New York Univ. 1986).
- Roccos 1989: L.J. Roccos, "Apollo Palatinus: The Augustan Apollo on the Sorrento Base," *AJA* 93 (1989) 571–88.
- Roccos 1991: L.J. Roccos, "Athena from a House on the Areopagos," *Hesperia* 60 (1991) 397–410.
- Rockwell 1989: P. Rockwell, *Lavorare la pietra* (Rome 1989).
- Rotroff 1990: S.I. Rotroff, "Building a Hellenistic Chronology," in J.P. Uhlenbrock, *The Coroplast's Art* (New Rochelle, N.Y. 1990) 22–30, esp. 28–29 with other references.
- Shapiro 1989: H.A. Shapiro, *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz 1989).
- Smith 1988: R.R.R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford 1988).
- Smith 1991: R.R.R. Smith, *Hellenistic Sculpture: A Handbook* (London 1991).
- Snodgrass 1987: A.M. Snodgrass, *An Archaeology of Greece. The Present State and Future Scope of a Discipline* (Sather Classical Lectures 53, Berkeley 1987).
- Sourvinou-Inwood 1978: C. Sourvinou-Inwood, "Per-

- sephone and Aphrodite at Locri: A Model for Personality Definitions in Greek Religion," *JHS* 98 (1978) 101–21, with additional bibliography.
- Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Studies in Girls' Transitions: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography* (Athens 1988).
- Sourvinou-Inwood 1991: C. Sourvinou-Inwood, "Reading" *Greek Culture: Text and Images, Rituals and Myths* (Oxford 1991).
- Stewart 1977: A.F. Stewart, *Skopas of Paros* (Park Ridge, N.J. 1977).
- Stewart 1979: A.F. Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (*JHS* Suppl. 14, London 1979).
- Stewart 1985: A.F. Stewart, "History, Myth, and Allegory in the Program of the Temple of Athena Nike, Athens," *Studies in the History of Art* 16 (Washington, D.C. 1985) 53–73.
- Stewart 1990: A.F. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration* (New Haven 1990).
- Stewart 1993a: A.F. Stewart, *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics* (Berkeley 1993).
- Stewart 1993b: A.F. Stewart, "Narration and Allusion in the Hellenistic Baroque," in P.J. Holliday ed., *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993) 130–74.
- Sturgeon 1987: M.C. Sturgeon, *Isthmia 4: Sculpture I: 1952–1967* (Princeton 1987).
- Tagalidou 1993: E. Tagalidou, *Weihreliefs an Herakles aus klassischer Zeit* (*SIMA-PB* 99, Jonsered 1993).
- Todisco 1993: L. Todisco, *Scultura greca del IV secolo. Maestri e scuole di statuaria tra classicità ed ellenismo* (Reptori fotografici Longanesi & C. 8, Milan 1993).
- Weis 1992: A. Weis, *The Hanging Marsyas and Its Copies* (*Archaeologica* 103, Rome 1992).
- Zanker 1993: P. Zanker, "The Hellenistic Grave Stelai from Smyrna: Identity and Self-image in the Polis," in A. Bullock et al. eds., *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1993) 212–30.