

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

1996

The State of Research on Ancient Art

Brunilde S. Ridgway
Bryn Mawr College, bridgway@brynmawr.edu

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

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs

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

Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1996. "The State of Research on Ancient Art." *The Art Bulletin* 68.1: 7-23.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/175

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

The State of Research on Ancient Art

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

It may seem presumptuous for an archaeologist to write an essay summarizing and evaluating current research on ancient art, and I approach the task with considerable misgivings. Not only is the task itself inherently liable to subjectivity and bound to be shaped by arbitrary selection and personal interests and expertise, but in this case the very competence of the writer can be challenged. My own claim to "legitimacy" within art-historical circles lies not so much in my own research in the field of classical sculpture as in the fact that for eight years (1978-1985) I have been Editor-in-Chief of the *American Journal of Archaeology*. It is therefore assumed that a broad spectrum of contributions on ancient art was submitted for my consideration, and that this experience should give me the broad overview on current approaches that is needed for this essay.¹

To be sure, the *AJA* is an archaeological journal, also dealing with matters entirely removed from aesthetic concerns, such as excavation reports, topographical studies, historic and prehistoric patterns of life and social conditions. In addition, the *AJA* is not the sole American publication dealing with ancient art, since *Hesperia*, the journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, is the proper forum for any discussion of matters concerned with American excavations on Greek soil and, consequently, of art objects deriving from such research, or even of theories on classical art propounded by former or present members of the ASCSA. Somewhat the same situation obtains for the American Academy in Rome, with its *Memoirs*. Other periodicals with more limited circulation open their pages to numerous articles dealing with classical art: *Archaeological News*; *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*; *California Studies in Classical Archaeology*; *The Classical Journal*; and the Canadian *Phoenix*, to name a few; and the bulletins of individual collections and museums: *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal*, the *Journal of the Wal-*

ters Art Gallery, *MUSE* of the University of Missouri, again to cite some non-obvious examples. Finally, many Americans often choose to publish on topics of ancient art in foreign periodicals (e.g., the *Athenische* or *Römische Mitteilungen* of the German Archaeological Institute, *Antike Kunst*, the *Bollettino d'arte*), either because of the appropriateness of the subject, or to continue a dialogue begun by a foreign scholar.

By way of contrast, however, the American *Art Bulletin* seems to deal with ancient art on a very limited basis. For instance, during the period between 1978 and June 1985, which coincides with my editorship of *AJA*, a single article dealt exclusively with an ancient subject.² Other contributions focused on much later periods and used ancient art as a source, rather than as a topic,³ while others treated periods late enough to be classified as Byzantine/Early Christian or themes with long-lasting iconographic ramifications.⁴ Some ancient motifs are indeed so general and wide-ranging that their geographic and chronological coverage exceeds the boundaries of classical art.⁵ Book reviews were more numerous, but gave preference to general subjects, works written by American scholars or in English, and topics connected with local museums; during the years I have surveyed, they ranged from a minimum of one per year to a maximum of eleven.

This state of affairs, which is obviously conditioned by the rotating editorships not only of the *Art Bulletin* but also of all the various journals within the United States, has induced me to attempt the task at hand. I was also greatly encouraged by the statement that "Indeed, it was the application of the methods of classical archaeology to other periods that gradually brought about rigorous standards of art-historical scholarship in American universities."⁶ Yet a few caveats are in order.

As an archaeologist, my primary concern is with un-

¹ I am grateful to Professor Richard E. Spear, Editor-in-Chief of *The Art Bulletin*, for asking me to write this essay on classical art in the series, now beginning in the journal, on the state of research in the principal fields of art history. It may be helpful to the reader, before embarking on a reading of my text, to have some idea of how I would define art history as contrasted with archaeology — since I have accepted the task of writing as an archaeologist dealing with ancient art. I take art history to be the study of the history of aesthetically pleasing objects, in a scale ranging from the beautiful artifact to the masterpiece. By contrast, archaeology is concerned with *any* object from the ancient past, regardless of its aesthetic value and artistic importance, as a clue to cultural reconstruction.

Ed. note: The following abbreviations of journal titles conform to the most recent usage of the *American Journal of Archaeology* and are listed after the footnotes.

² J.L. Benson, "Picture, Ornament, and Periodicity in Attic Geometric

Vase-Painting," *ArtB*, LXIV, 1982, 535-549.

³ E.g., in *ArtB*, LXV, 1983, A. Faxon, "Cézanne's Sources for *Les Grandes Baigneuses*," 320-22, and H. Joyce, "The Ancient Frescoes from the Villa Negroni and Their Influence in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," 423-440; M.P. Mezzatesta, "Marcus Aurelius, Fray Antonio de Guevara, and the Ideal of the Perfect Prince in the Sixteenth Century," *ArtB*, LXVI, 1984, 620-633.

⁴ E.g., F. Yegul, "A Study in Architectural Iconography: *Kaisersaal* and the Imperial Cult," *ArtB*, LXIV, 1982, 7-31; K.J. Shelton, "The Consular Muse of Flavius Constantius," *ArtB*, XLV, 1983, 7-23.

⁵ E.g., I.B. Jaffe, "The Flying Gallop: East and West," *ArtB*, LXV, 1983, 183-200; the motif is traced down to the end of our 18th century.

⁶ C. Richter Sherman, in Sherman *et al.*, eds., *Women as Interpreters of the Visual Arts 1820-1979*, Westport, CT, and London, 1981, 29.

earthing the past (both literally and metaphorically) and recreating it; I may therefore consider of importance trends that would not seem equally significant from an aesthetic or art-historical point of view. In addition, if I am to speak on the basis of my editorial experience, my survey of classical (i.e., Graeco-Roman) art has to focus on the chronological span covered by the *AJA*, which in the past eight years has received disappointingly few submissions on late antique and Early Christian topics, even when we explicitly stated our willingness to consider them.⁷ For all intents and purposes, therefore, my review will be limited to the period from approximately the eighth century B.C. to the third century A.D., with a personal bias in favor of sculpture and Greek art. Finally, I shall try to include citation of foreign perspectives and approaches, but I claim no thoroughness of coverage, in terms either of bibliography or of media or subfields of artistic production.

The Literature

To be sure, only primary fields, such as sculpture and architecture, are of major interest to art historians and archaeologists alike. That such interest is alive and well even within the general public is shown most clearly by the surprising wave of enthusiasm that swept Italy and other countries when the splendid bronze Warriors found in the sea near Riace were first displayed in Florence, and then in Rome, in 1981. They have since been the subject of discussion, in scholarly periodicals as well as in more popular magazines and pamphlets, and several papers on them have been presented at national and international professional gatherings. In late December 1984, two superb volumes on the Warriors' restoration, technique, and stylistic import were published, most appropriately, as a supplement to the *Bollettino d'arte*. The articles in the second volume could indeed be considered typical, and can therefore be usefully summarized here as representative of the latest trends and approaches among contemporary scholars confronted with a previously unknown and archaeologically unstratified work of art.⁸

The most obvious tendency — indeed, the longest-lived in studies of ancient art, beginning well before Furtwängler's authoritative *Meisterwerke* (1893) — is that of attributing the two statues to a major sculptor. Confronted with beauty, the art historian automatically searches among the ancient sources for references to specific monuments by great masters; in the absence of such, the attribution proceeds by artists' importance, again as established by Greek and Roman writers, as long as chronologically compatible with stylistic assessment. Thus, for the Riace bronzes, Phei-

dias is the name first and most often cited, and if the two Warriors are not by the same hand, then one belongs to a member of the Pheidias School. Other suggestions are Onatas, Myron, Alkamenes. Only few are the doubts that it might be possible to make convincing attributions to one of the many names preserved to us from antiquity, whose bearers still remain shadowy artistic personalities at best, including some major figures active in Magna Graecia.

Second only to the *Meisterfrage* is the issue of subject identification and, with it, that of provenience or connection with a monument cited by the ancient sources. Iconography, to be sure, is one of the major concerns in contemporary research on ancient art, and I shall return to this point later. Suffice it here to say, with regard to the Warriors, that statue A is most often considered a hero or a king (the lesser Aias? Agamemnon?), while B is identified with a general. Alternatively, both are seen as Attic Eponymous Heroes, whether from the monument in the Athenian Agora or from the Marathon Dedication at Delphi. Olympia is another site often cited as the possible origin of the two (the Achaian Dedication?) or, more tentatively, Lokroi in Magna Graecia. On a more generic level, the figures are interpreted as hoplitodromoi, at the end of a race in armor and symbolic of victory, set up in a sanctuary (Athens?) after each event, which would explain the difference in date most scholars detect between the two.

Chronology and style represent in fact the third line of attack in this analysis of the work of art. Here traditional trends are again in evidence: dating is relative rather than absolute, and rests on comparison with other sculptures, occasionally originals of Greek date but most often Roman copies of presumed Greek prototypes now lost. In the case of the Warriors, the span involved is relatively narrow — from ca. 460 to ca. 400 B.C., although a lower limit of 430 is a more likely possibility. A minority viewpoint suggests that the bronzes may be eclectic, imitating different Greek styles, and thus to be considered Classicizing rather than Classical. In this case, they would date no earlier than the first century B.C. and probably later. This different stylistic reading of the same evidence is again symptomatic of a widespread lack of agreement among scholars that primarily, although not exclusively, permeates the entire field of sculptural studies.

Finally, the contents of the first volume include excellent photographs of technical details, photogrammetric "contour lines" of both Warriors, charts of metallurgical analyses, and reconstruction of casting methods. This approach too is highly representative of current trends: increased interest in the technical processes underlying the creation of a work of art, the use of sophisticated modern technology,

⁷ An initial Editorial Statement in *AJA*, LXXXII, 1978, 1, that the journal would limit its coverage to the classical period, had to be retracted when the president of the Byzantine Studies Conference, as spokesman for his constituency, asked us to reconsider. (See *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 1.)

⁸ L. Vlad Borrelli and P. Pelagatti, eds., *Due bronzi da Riace. rinvenimento, restauro, analisi ed ipotesi d'interpretazione* (BdA, serie speciale III, Rome, 1984). Although the volumes were printed in October, 1984,

the official "presentation" did not take place until July 10, 1985. The art-historical interpretations in the second volume are by P.E. Arias, A. Di Vita, G. Dontas, A. Giuliano, E. Paribeni, B.S. Ridgway, and C. Rolley. To the bibliography collected on pp. 333-37, add now also E.B. Harrison, "Early Classical Sculpture: The Bold Style," in C.G. Boulter, *Greek Art, Archaic into Classical, A Symposium Held at the University of Cincinnati April 2-3, 1982*, Leiden, 1985, 40-65.

the attention to compositions and alloys with all their possible chronological implications.

Classical Sculpture

If from the particular focus on the Riace Warriors we move to the general plan of current studies on classical sculpture, we find that the same tendencies are well represented in art-historical literature.⁹ The occasional monograph or article on the single master is still in vogue, although usually limited to the Greek, as against the more anonymous Roman production.¹⁰ It should be admitted that such lines of inquiry are rarer than they were, say, at the turn of the century, or even fifty years ago, perhaps in a tacit admission of the difficulty of reconstructing artistic personalities from a largely undocumented past.¹¹ Nevertheless, handbooks and general works on ancient art are still written from the perspective of attributions to major masters, and the present generation of college students taking Art 101 is still taught about Praxitelean sfumato, Skopasian pathos, and Pheidian majesty. I shall return to this point later.

By contrast, iconography, as already mentioned, has come to the forefront of contemporary studies, not only on sculpture but also on any other figural form, such as vase painting or the minor arts. Perhaps symptomatic of this interest are the creation and current publication, in installments, of the monumental *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, which represents an international effort to record iconographically all the known objects of ancient art within each country, whether in public or private collections.¹² This increased attention to subject matter has produced meaningful results that go well beyond the practical advantages of classification and categorization — methods so often used by archaeologists almost as an end in themselves! Our perception of the works of art has been heightened with regard to their wider cultural context.¹³

This is especially true for architectural sculpture, which

can be interpreted at the primary, elementary level of its narrative (and literary) content; then at the more advanced level of its locational relationship (that is, in relation to the specific building and sanctuary it adorned, and even the region of the ancient world in which it stood or by which it had been commissioned for somewhere else — for instance, the Magna Graecian treasuries at Olympia and Delphi); and finally at the highest level of political and philosophical allusions, where each object, item of clothing, or gesture connected with a figure may carry cultic and programmatic symbolism.

I can think of no better example of this approach than the recent flurry of publications on the Parthenon sculptures. Sparked by the excellent photographic documentation of metopes, pediments, and frieze made available by Frank Brommer,¹⁴ Parthenon studies have received renewed impetus from the establishment at Basel of a museum of styrofoam casts reproducing all extant fragments, both questionably or unquestionably attributed to the Athenian temple. The light-weight material of the reproductions allows for easy shifting and recombining of compositions, and missing parts can be tentatively reconstructed along fifth-century proportions.¹⁵ An international congress held in the Swiss city in 1982 has now been published in two solid volumes that range from architectural speculation to sculptural attributions and interpretations.¹⁶

Current restoration work of the buildings on the Athenian Akropolis and recent finds and identification of Parthenon sculptures have prompted new suggestions and integrations; some were mentioned, for instance, at another international symposium — this one on Archaic and Classical sculpture — sponsored by the German Archaeological Institute in Athens in April 1985, and soon to be published. Besides these fragments, the edited papers will present many new and exciting monuments. Theories and explanations of that eternal puzzle, the Parthenon frieze, continue in an unabated flow despite over a century of research.¹⁷ Another item of great iconographic interest, the Shield of the Athena

⁹ Some comments on the same topic can also be found in my introduction to an *AJA* issue dedicated to sculptural studies: *AJA*, LXXXVI, 1982, 155-57. See also my Foreword to K.D. Morrow, *Greek Footwear and the Dating of Sculpture (Wisconsin Studies in Classics)*, Madison, 1985.

¹⁰ E.g., O. Palagia, *Euphranor*, Leiden, 1980; J. Dörig, *Onatas of Aegina*, Leiden, 1977; A.F. Stewart, *Skopas of Paros*, Park Ridge, NJ, 1977; E.B. Harrison, "Alkamenes' Sculptures for the Hephaisteion," Pts. I-III, *AJA*, LXXXI, 1977, 137-178, 265-287, 411-426.

For an attempt to attribute certain portraits of Lucius Verus to a single hand, see F.C. Albertson, "A Portrait of Lucius Verus in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, and Its Artist," *AJA*, LXXXVII, 1983, 153-163.

¹¹ See, e.g., the comments by R. Wünsche, *Jdl*, xciv, 1979, 107-111.

¹² *LIMC*, I, 1981; II, 1984. For a review of the project see, e.g., *AJA*, LXXXVI, 1982, 599-600, by B.S. Ridgway.

¹³ See, e.g., the preface and introduction by W.G. Moon, as editor of *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*, Madison, 1983, and several of the articles in that volume, which published the papers presented at a symposium of the same title, April 9-11, 1981. The essays and the volume include much useful bibliography. See also E. Simon, *ZPE*, LVII, 1984, 1-22.

¹⁴ F. Brommer, *Die Metopen des Parthenon - Katalog und Untersuchung*, Mainz, 1967; *Der Parthenonfries - Katalog und Untersuchung*, Mainz, 1977; *Die Skulpturen der Parthenon-Giebel - Katalog und Untersuchung*, Mainz, 1963.

¹⁵ See, e.g., the comments by E. Berger *et al.*, *AntK*, xxiii, 1980, 59-64.

¹⁶ E. Berger, ed., *Parthenon-Kongress Basel. Referate und Berichte*, 4. bis 8. April 1982, Mainz, 1984.

¹⁷ Two articles appeared, e.g., in a single issue of *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1, 1985: M.C. Root, "The Parthenon Frieze and the Apadana Reliefs at Persepolis: Reassessing a Programmatic Relationship," 103-120; and I.D. Jenkins, "The Composition of the So-Called Eponymous Heroes on the East Frieze of the Parthenon," 121-27. They were published in the Centennial Issue of the journal because the first issue one hundred years earlier had featured an article on the same subject.

See also I.S. Mark, "The Gods on the East Frieze of the Parthenon," *Hesperia*, LIII, 1984, 289-342; and L. Beschi, "Il fregio del Partenone: Una proposta di lettura," *RendLinc*, ser. 8, xxxix, 1984, 1-23, repeated in Greek at the D.A.I. Symposium in Athens, April 1985, mentioned in the text following n. 16.

Parthenos with its Amazonomachy relief, is being gradually illuminated through new finds and deeper insights,¹⁸ and will perhaps attract even greater attention when a life-size replica of it appears, as attribute of the recreated cult image, beside the Athena by Alan LeQuire being prepared for the cella of the Nashville Parthenon.¹⁹ Although such modern reconstructions may be no more faithful reflections of the original than the extant Roman copies at reduced scale, the Nashville project has the definite advantage of reproducing the colossal scale of the Pheidias statue within an architectural frame of exactly the same size as the original setting, thus allowing us to judge the general visibility and compositional effect, and the sheer impact of the mass of the fifth-century creation.

Other long-standing iconographic problems of Classical sculpture from other buildings are also being tackled — the Ilissos frieze, for instance, or that of the so-called Hephaisteion, whose identification as the Temple of Athena and Hephaistos is again controversial, on iconographic and now also perhaps on topographic grounds.²⁰ Hellenistic and Roman architectural sculpture seems less debated, but more Etruscan monuments are being recomposed and studied, at times with different interpretations. This is particularly true of funerary urns, some of which are now seen to carry representations of local, not of Greek, myths.²¹

Iconographic studies are inevitably intertwined with problems of chronology and style. An old controversy, for instance, has flared up again over the five "Plinian" Amazons of Ephesos, but it now focuses not so much on attributions of types to masters as on issues of date, meaning, and unity of composition. Were the extant types truly created at the same time, or are they products of different periods, each one echoing the others as a meaningful allusion, perhaps even down into Roman times, and as personifications rather than Amazons?²²

It is clear that monuments and subjects created to carry a specific message within a certain period and place could be imbued with a different content when adapted to a new setting at a later time. Here again a recent spectacular discovery can be used as paradigmatic. "Excavation" of Ro-

man museums and storerooms has allowed Eugenio La Rocca to reassemble a pedimental Amazonomachy that was carved in the 440's B.C. for the Temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria, on the Greek island of Euboea. There it replaced a similar composition, carved toward the end of the Archaic period, perhaps in allusion to the wars between East and West current at the time, and destroyed by the Persians in 490 B.C. That the Classical Amazonomachy pediment also celebrated the Greek victory over the Persians seems hardly in doubt, regardless of iconographic continuity and respect for tradition. After the temple of Apollo was finally destroyed by Sulla in 87 B.C., and probably under Augustus, the remains of both the Archaic and the Classical pediment were taken to Rome — to save them, however, not to loot them. There, the Classical Amazonomachy was appropriately reused in the gable of the Temple of Apollo Medicus (the so-called Temple of Apollo Sosianus), but this time the message was an allusion to Augustus' victories in the East, at Actium, and to the emperor's efforts to revitalize earlier cults and especially that of Apollo. That this interpretation is not farfetched is shown by the fact that the other Classical pediment from that same Eretrian temple, showing the Killing of the Niobids, could not be adapted to fit the ideological program of the monuments in the Circus Flaminius, and was therefore relegated to the Gardens of Sallust, as a purely mythological decoration. This exciting discovery has been published very recently in the catalogue of an exhibition (April-June 1985) of the newly recognized sculptural fragments. They return to us, unexpectedly, an entire pediment from a major period of Greek sculpture and a large Classical temple.²³

As a by-product, the recognition of an Eretrian pediment of fifth-century date helps settle an issue of chronology that might have drastically altered our stylistic framework for the late Archaic and Early Classical periods. A considerable lowering of the dates of many famous monuments has been suggested in a series of recent writings by two British scholars, but since a Classical composition at Eretria requires that the previous pediment be surely earlier than 490, the proposal (in which the Archaic pediment from the Temple

¹⁸ E.B. Harrison, "Motifs of the City-Siege on the Shield of Athena Parthenos," *AJA*, LXXXV, 1981, 281-317, publishing new sarcophagus fragments from Aphrodisias. See also J. Boardman, "Herakles, Theseus and Amazons," in D. Kurtz and B. Sparkes, eds., *The Eye of Greece. Studies in the Art of Greece*, Cambridge, 1982, 1-28, esp. 18-27.

¹⁹ See, e.g., *Art News*, Summer, 1985, 13-14, with a photograph of the sculptor at work, giving an idea of the Athena's scale.

²⁰ Ilissos Frieze: C.A. Picón, *AJA*, LXXXII, 1978, 47-81; A. Krug, *AntP*, xviii, 1979, 7-21.

Hephaisteion Frieze: S. von Bockelberg, *AntP*, xviii, 1979, 23-50; the identification of the temple has been challenged by E.B. Harrison (see supra, n. 10); the identification of the structure in the Athenian Agora as the Sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania may now require some topographical rethinking: T.L. Shear, *Hesperia*, LIII, 1984, 1-57. For general comments on both friezes, see B.S. Ridgway, *Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton, 1981, 85-89, with additional references.

²¹ See, e.g., J.P. Small, *Studies Related to the Theban Cycle on Late Etruscan Urns*, Rome, 1981, reviewed by M. Del Chiaro in *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984,

88-90; in the same volume, see also L. Bonfante, "Human Sacrifice on an Etruscan Funerary Urn," 531-539, with additional bibliography.

The same attempt to correlate iconography and regional customs has been applied to sculpture in the round, and has led to the suggestion that the famous Hanging Marsyas derives not from Asia Minor but from Italic traditions: A. Weis, "The Motif of the *Adligatus* and Tree: A Study in the Sources of Pre-Roman Iconography," *AJA*, LXXXVI, 1982, 21-38; a monograph on the subject is forthcoming.

²² For a summary of the problem, see B.S. Ridgway, *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture. The Problem of the Originals*, Ann Arbor, 1984, 99-100, with previous bibliography; add M. Weber, "Die Amazonen von Ephesos II," *Jdl*, xcix, 1984, 75-126. The theory that the so-called fifth Amazon is instead a personification of the city of Ephesos is K. Hartswick's: *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 333.

²³ E. La Rocca, *Amazonomachia. Le sculture frontonali del tempio di Apollo Sosiano*, Rome, 1985; for discussion of chronology and meaning, see esp. p. 77 and n. 24; the Niobids are discussed on pp. 71-72. Additional comments by La Rocca will appear in the publication of the 1985 D.A.I. Symposium in Athens.

of Apollo formed a major part of the argument) is now invalidated.²⁴ This example is cited to stress how uncertain our knowledge of chronology and style still is. The challenge was serious, in part even justifiable, and created some ripples in the archaeological pond.²⁵ New finds occasionally confirm traditional knowledge, but some may destroy previous tenets and prove real bones of contention.

One such discovery was that of the epic sculptural groups from the grotto of Sperlonga (1957), which to this day are variously dated from the second century B.C. to the late first century A.D., as Hellenistic originals or Roman copies; or — a more disconcerting although more likely possibility — as Roman creations in Hellenistic style. The Laokoon, whose masters' names have been found inscribed on one of the Sperlonga groups, has been carried along in the same tidal wave of speculation.²⁶

It is becoming increasingly clear that specific styles continue long past their peak period, and represent not simply romantic revivals of the golden past, when they recur, but specific iconographic messages delivered in the style reputed appropriate for the topic. We can generally distinguish between Archaic and Archaistic, but we have much greater difficulty in separating Severe from Severizing, Classical from Classicizing,²⁷ and especially Hellenistic from Roman "Baroque" — that is, epic — style. The task becomes proportionately more difficult when the date of the supposed prototype is to be derived from Roman "copies," which inevitably carry stylistic traits of their own epoch, even when faithfully attempting to reproduce an earlier

model. In many cases, however, it is obvious that generic imitation and emulation are involved, rather than mechanical copying, and it is therefore almost impossible to be sure whether the monument in question is representative of Greek or of Roman styles.²⁸ At Karian Aphrodisias, the excellence of the sculptors imparts a Hellenistic look even to works created in the second or third century A.D.²⁹

Several scholars have made important contributions to these difficult studies, but we are far from reaching consensus and the issue is emotionally loaded. It can certainly be considered the most controversial area of current sculptural research.

Even when dealing with original Greek material, chronology and style remain difficult to assess — witness the recent shifting of the Priene coffers from the traditional second-century B.C. date back to one in the mid-fourth century, contemporary with the Halikarnassos Mausoleum sculptures.³⁰ If this redating carries conviction, other issues remain open: dates for the pedimental sculptures from the Hieron at Samothrace, for instance, oscillate between the third and the second century B.C.; those of the Belevi Mausoleum between the fourth and the first — and these are cases in which epigraphical and architectural evidence is also available to contribute to our chronological assessment! Even Roman monuments and portraits, despite their frequent historical connections and content, can be assigned to different periods, some at considerable distance from each other.³¹

Formal analyses of style have become much less fre-

²⁴ D. Francis and M. Vickers, "Signa priscae artis: Eretria and Siphnos," *JHS*, ciii, 1983, 49-67, with reference to other publications on the same subject.

²⁵ See, e.g., J. Boardman, "Signa tabulae priscae artis," *JHS*, civ, 1984, 161-63; Ridgway in Boulter, *Greek Art, Archaic into Classical* (as in n. 8), 4-6. More conciliatory is R. Tölle-Kastenbein, *AA*, 1983, 572-584.

²⁶ For the most recent discussion of these problems, see E. Simon, "Laokoon und die Geschichte der antiken Kunst," *AA*, 1984, 641-672, which includes comments on the Sperlonga sculptures. The official publication of the latter remains B. Conticello and B. Andraea, *AntP*, xiv, 1974.

²⁷ For a recent discussion of "Archaistic," see M.D. Fullerton, "Archaistic Draped Statuary in the Round of the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods," Ph.D. Diss., Bryn Mawr College, 1982; cf. also B.S. Ridgway, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton, 1977, chap. 11.

The term "Severizing" was coined by B.S. Ridgway, *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton, 1970, 142. See chap. 9 *passim*, and the comments by E.B. Harrison in *Greek Art, Archaic into Classical* (as in n. 8), 55-56.

For "Classicizing," see esp. P. Zanker, *Klassizistische Statuen. Studien zur Veränderung des Kunstgeschmacks in der römische Kaiserzeit*, Mainz, 1974. See also my *Fifth Century Styles* (as in n. 20), chap. 9, and *Roman Copies* (as in n. 22), *passim*, but esp. 81-86, with bibliog. For a specific example, see, e.g., M.C. Sturgeon, "A Classicizing Statue in Ancient Corinth," *AJA*, lxxxvi, 1982, 219-226.

²⁸ The problem is discussed at length in my *Roman Copies* (as in n. 22). The plaster casts found at Baiae, and now finally published in *extenso* (C. Landwehr, *Die antiken Gipsabgüsse aus Baiae. Griechische Bronzeplastiken in Abgüsse römischer Zeit*, Berlin, 1985), probably raise as many questions as they solve on the issue of mechanical copying in Roman times. See also Landwehr, *Einführung in das römische Kopienwesen*, n.p., 1984 (*non vidi*). Regrettably, the entire issue is beset by personal prejudices, since most scholars prefer to assume that a Roman work copies a

Greek original, even if poorly, rather than accepting the possibility of an outright Roman creation. Indeed, Roman work — if not in the realm of portraiture, sarcophagi, or historical reliefs — is still considered aesthetically "inferior" to Greek.

²⁹ A book by the excavator, K.T. Erim, *Aphrodisias, City of Aphrodite*, is announced as forthcoming in 1985-86 (*Aphrodisias Excavations Bulletin*, lxxxiv/v, 1, 9). For some color photographs, see, meanwhile, *National Geographic*, clx, 4, 1981, 527-551.

³⁰ The coffers of the pteron of the Temple of Athena at Priene, carved with a Gigantomachy and probably also an Amazonomachy, have been thoroughly studied and redated by J.C. Carter, *The Sculpture of the Sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene*, London, 1983. See the review by A.F. Stewart, *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 363.

³¹ Samothracian Hieron: the official publication is P.W. Lehmann *et al.*, *Samothrace 3. The Hieron*, Princeton, 1969, and a date in the second half of the 2nd century B.C. is suggested on pp. 301-317, esp. 313. For a late 4th-early 3rd-century date, see A. Linfert, *Kunstzentren Hellenistischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden, 1976, 126-28; see also H.A. Thompson, review of Lehmann, *Archaeology*, xxvi, 3, 1973, 228-29.

Belevi Mausoleum: C. Praschniker *et al.*, *Das Mausoleum von Belevi (Forschungen in Ephesos, vi)*, Vienna, 1979; for a chart of all suggested dates, see p. 197. For a critical, lengthy review see D. Pinkwart, *BonnJbb*, clxxxiii, 1983, 764-772.

For disagreement on the dates of Roman monuments, see, e.g., J.C. Anderson, "The Date of the Arch at Orange," *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 323 (Abstract), in which the Arch is moved from a Julio-Claudian to a Severan date. See also J.C. Balty, "Le prétendu Marc-Aurèle d'Avenches," *Eikones, Festschrift H. Jucker (AntK, Suppl. vol. xii)*, Bern, 1980, 57-63 (dated late antique).

For a redating of some Aphrodisian sculptors working in Rome, from the 2nd to the 4th century A.D., see K.T. Erim and C.M. Roueché, *BSR*, l, 1982, 102-115.

quent, perhaps as a result of the above-mentioned difficulties, but a few are still carried out with a slightly different approach — one that tends to rely on mechanical (“objective”) determinations to produce generic formulas that can then be applied to disparate works of sculpture to assess stylistic affiliations and date.

One such attempt was made to pinpoint asymmetries in facial features and cranial construction of Greek original heads. Although the formula thus obtained seems to apply only to Severe and Classical, not to Archaic, or Hellenistic works, the method may be useful to gauge the intended angle of vision and turn of the head when in its original position — a useful consideration, now that so many of them have survived only as *disiecta membra*. Another approach has utilized cross-sections of bare torsos and garments at the hem, again in order to determine the formal language of the calmly standing statue in the fifth century B.C. — studying, however, both Greek originals and Roman copies in the process. Finally, and this research is still in course of publication, close measurements of Archaic statues are being used to clarify the beginnings of contrapposto, from the initial distinction between free and weight-bearing leg and the consequent shifts in musculature throughout the body. Templates, plumb-lines, and frames are employed in the process, and complex projections and sections are obtained for each work.³²

Technology can help these chronological and stylistic controversies, but still to a relative extent. Photogrammetry and computer analysis of sculptural proportions have given us greater understanding of Archaic kouroi and kourai, their stylistic affiliations, and their relative sequence in

time.³³ Isotopic analysis of marbles, by determining affinities or dissimilarities, may prove or disprove theories of provenience and attribution.³⁴ Metallurgical studies are not yet at the point where alloys can provide indisputable chronological evidence, and bronze-casting techniques have been shown by recent finds to be both more complex and more conservative through the ages than previously believed.³⁵ Yet methods and experiments developed for space physics research (to analyze the moon rocks, for instance) have helped prove the authenticity of the bronze horse in the Metropolitan Museum in New York,³⁶ and the same technical equipment employed by Alitalia to test the metal strength of their Boeing aircrafts was borrowed by the Reggio Museum to verify the condition of the Riace Warriors four years after their public display.³⁷

Beyond these more or less traditional concerns, other tendencies and directions can be singled out today in the study of classical sculpture. Although none of them can be considered entirely new, slight shifts in emphasis and in the types of questions being asked make them worth reviewing.

A sociological, almost urban approach is most obvious in studies on Roman sculpture. Programmatic ensembles, Roman criteria in the selection of Greek monuments or the creation of their own, and Roman taste and dynastic aspirations as revealed through sculptural styles and subjects are receiving increased scrutiny and greater understanding.³⁸ An important trend is the attempt to look at each Roman monument as part of a larger complex whose message derives from the sum of its parts, rather than from each individual piece. We are therefore studying the dec-

³² Asymmetry in heads: L.A. Schneider, *Asymmetrie griechischer Köpfe vom 5. Jh. bis zum Hellenismus*, Wiesbaden, 1973; see my review in *AJA*, LXX, 1976, 93-94. The research seems to have been conducted mostly on casts, which may have serious consequences for the results when the discrepancies involved can be counted in millimeters. The approach nonetheless seems useful, and the use of facial cross-sections seems to be spreading, even without reference to asymmetries; see, e.g., E.B. Harrison in *The Eye of Greece* (as in n. 18), 57.

Cross-sections of torsos and drapery: see F. Hiller, *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur griechischen Statue des späten 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Mainz, 1971.

Beginnings of contrapposto: I. Kleemann, *Frühe Bewegung. Untersuchungen zur archaischen Form bis zum Aufkommen der Ponderation in der griechischen Kunst*, 1, Mainz, 1984, is to be followed by three additional volumes.

For formal analysis without mechanical means and with secondary dating considerations, see J. Hurwit, “Image and Frame in Greek Art,” *AJA*, LXXI, 1977, 1-30.

³³ See, e.g., E. Guralnick, *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 399-409, with previous bibliography.

Worth noting among the proportional studies, although not aided by technology in this case, is R. Tobin’s solution to the canon of Polykleitos: *AJA*, LXXIX, 1975, 307-321.

³⁴ See, most recently, B.S. Ridgway and N. Herz, *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 519, for an immediate application of the method detailed by G.V. Foster and Herz on p. 331 of the same volume. See also N. Herz, “Isotopic Analysis of Marbles,” in G. Rapp, Jr., and J.A. Gifford, eds., *Archaeological Geology*, New Haven and London, 1985, 331-351.

³⁵ See my paper for the D.A.I. Symposium in Athens, soon to appear in print, and the forthcoming book by C.J. Eiseman and myself, *The Porticello Shipwreck: A Mediterranean Merchant Vessel of 415-385 B.C.*, Texas A&M University Press. For two bronze statues dated by inscription ca. 300-319 A.D., and still using some of the Classical methods, see K. Weidemann, *Könige aus dem Yemen*, Mainz, 1983.

³⁶ The basic technique was thermoluminescence, but applied in a new way (to measure zircon) that had been devised for the lunar samples by the Laboratory of Space Physics at George Washington University: K. Leffert et al., *Journal of American Institute for Conservation*, XXI, 1981, 19-20; see also *Washington University Magazine*, XLIII, Winter, 1973, 22-25.

³⁷ As reported by G. Bonifacio in *Ulisse 2000 (Rivista bimestrale di bordo, Alitalia)*, xxv, June-July, 1985, 176-181.

³⁸ See the recent bibliography in my *Roman Copies* (as in n. 22) and P. Zanker, “Der Apollontempel auf dem Palatin,” in *Città e architettura nella Roma Imperiale (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici, Suppl. x)*, 1983, 21-40; B. Wesenberg, “Augustus-forum und Akropolis,” *JdI*, xcix, 1984, 161-185; G.F. Pinney, *AJA*, LXXXV, 1981, 212.

oration of theaters, baths, Imperial or private villas, and even entire sanctuaries and civic centers.³⁹

In a more limited way, even Greek sculpture is being considered in its setting,⁴⁰ and sociological explanations are being sought for some genres, primary among which, for the recent number of publications, is that of "old destitutes": fishermen, shepherds, peasants. Such statues are usually considered Hellenistic creations, but they were certainly appreciated by Roman customers for their gardens, since most of the extant examples are Roman replicas.⁴¹ The problem of dating the prototypes remains, and is strictly connected with issues of content and preferences, including that for realism.

It may be helpful here to signal new trends in portraiture, in which realism, or verism, is a primary component. If the spectacular bronze head recovered from the Porticello wreck indeed represents a long-bearded philosopher, then our conceptions of the beginnings of realism in Greek portraits need revision, since the piece can be dated no later than the late fifth/early fourth century B.C. on the evidence of the excavated wreck, and is probably more than thirty years earlier on stylistic grounds. If, on the other hand, as

I believe, the head depicts a mythological being, perhaps a centaur or a sea-monster, then we should recognize that startling veristic effects were possible without claim to specific likeness, long before the Hellenistic period.⁴²

The pedagogical and sociological message of Greek portraits has also formed the subject of some penetrating studies, and even some apparent likenesses have been interpreted as idealizations along the lines of established types.⁴³ Roman portraits are still being studied along traditional lines, and this approach is now somewhat stagnant, although the flow of publications has not abated. Greater attention is, however, being paid to recutting, which transforms the features of one individual into those of another, for political or economic purposes.⁴⁴

Distribution patterns of sculpture are being plotted with increased frequency. In Roman terms, the research carries economic and administrative implications: the routes of sarcophagi are traced, for instance, to determine centers of production and channels of diffusion, some of them under Imperial control.⁴⁵ Mass production, stockpiling, and quarry organization are becoming better known, with the added help of underwater archaeologists, who have ex-

³⁹ Theaters: C. Schwingenstein, *Die Figurenausstattung des griechische Theatergebäudes*, Munich, 1977; G. Bejor, "La decorazione scultorea dei teatri romani nelle province africane," *Prospettiva*, xvii, 1979, 37-46.

Baths: H. Manderscheid, *Die Skulpturenausstattung der kaiserzeitlichen Thermenanlagen*, Berlin, 1981; M. Marvin, "Freestanding Sculptures from the Baths of Caracalla," *AJA*, lxxxvii, 1983, 347-384.

Villas: D. Panderimalis, "Zum Programm der Statuenausstattung in der Villa dei Papiri," *AthMitt*, lxxxvi, 1971, 173-209; J. Raeder, *Die statuarische Ausstattung der Villa Hadriana bei Tivoli*, Berlin, 1983.

Sanctuaries and cities: M. Bossert, *Die Rundskulpturen von Aventicum*, Bern, 1983; S. Diebner, *Aesernia-Venafrum. Untersuchungen zu den römischen Steindenkmälern zweier Landstädte Mittelitaliens*, Rome, 1979; the publication of the sculptures from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Cyrene, by S. Kane, is forthcoming.

See also: R. Bol, *Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphäums (Olympische Forschungen, xv)*, 1984; E.J. Dwyer, *Pompeian Sculpture in Its Domestic Context. A Study of Five Pompeian Houses and Their Contents*, Rome, 1982; D.K. Hill, "Some Sculpture from Roman Domestic Gardens," in E.B. MacDougall and W.F. Jashemski, eds., *Ancient Roman Gardens (Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture, vii)*, Washington, D.C., 1981, 81-92.

⁴⁰ See, e.g., Ridgway, "The Setting of Greek Sculpture," *Hesperia*, xl, 1971, 336-356, and, with some changes of mind, "Greek Antecedents of Garden Sculpture," in MacDougall and Jashemski, eds. (as in n. 39), 9-28.

⁴¹ N. Himmelmann, *Über Hirten-Genre in der antiken Kunst*, Opladen, 1980, and *Alexandria und der Realismus in der griechischen Kunst*, Tübingen, 1983; see review by A.F. Stewart in *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 363-64; H.P. Laubscher, *Fischer und Landleute. Studien zur hellenistischen Genre-Plastik*, Mainz, 1982; E. Bayer, *Fischerbilder in der hellenistischen Plastik*, Bonn, 1983 — both reviewed (by C.A. Picón) in *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 364-65. See also my *Fifth Century Styles* (as in n. 20), 230-34, and A.F. Stewart, *JRS*, lxxvii, 1977, 81 and n. 50.

For sociological explanations of sculpture, see, e.g., L.A. Schneider, *Zur sozialen Bedeutung der archaischen Korenstatuen*, Hamburg, 1975; F. Coarelli, "Classe dirigente romana e arti figurative," *DialAr*, iv-v, 1971, 241-265.

⁴² See E. Paribeni, "Le statue bronzee di Porticello," *BdA*, xxiv, 1984, 1-14 (with technical analyses on pp. 15-24), where a Hellenistic date for the

head is advocated. For a date ca. 440-430 B.C., based on style and on the date of the wreck, see my works cited in n. 35.

For recent comments on Greek portraits, see J. Frel, *Greek Portraits in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Malibu, 1981, and the new updated edition of G.M.A. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks*, revised and abridged by R.R.R. Smith, Ithaca, 1984.

⁴³ See, e.g., D. Metzler, *Porträt und Gesellschaft. Über die Entstehung des griechischen Porträts in der Klassik*, Münster, 1971; B. Frischer, *The Sculpted Word. Epicureanism and Philosophical Recruitment in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1982, reviewed in *ArtB*, lxxv, 1984, 332-35, by J.J. Pollitt. A.F. Stewart has suggested in a paper delivered for the AIA that many classical "portraits" were more or less personalized versions of standard ideal types: Themistokles from Herakles, Perikles from the mature citizens of the Parthenon frieze, Socrates (Type A) from a satyr; see his Abstract in *AJA*, lxxxvii, 1983, 262. That the opposite can occur, and that a "type" can be identified as an individual, is illustrated by the so-called Alexander the Great in Istanbul, which is now seen to belong to the Pergamon Gigantomachy frieze and therefore is bound to represent a giant, despite its resemblance to Alexander: W. Radt, *AA*, 1981, 583-596.

⁴⁴ For recent work on Roman portraiture, see, e.g., P. Zanker, *Provinzielle Kaiserporträts. Zur Rezeption des Selbstdarstellung des Princeps*, Munich, 1983; J. Pollini, "Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus and the Ravenna Relief," *RömMitt*, lxxxviii, 1981, 117-140; by the same author, "Dammatio Memoriae in Stone: Two Portraits of Nero Recut to Vespasian in American Museums," *AJA*, lxxxviii, 1984, 547-555, with additional references.

See also J.C. Balty, "Style et facture. Notes sur le portrait romain du III^e siècle de notre ère," *RA*, 1983, 301-315, who has many words of caution.

⁴⁵ J. Ward-Perkins, "The Marble Trade and Its Organization: Evidence from Nicomedia," *MAAR*, xxxvi, 1980, 325-338, and "Nicomedia and the Marble Trade," *BSR*, lviii, n.s. xxxv, 1980, 23-69. M. Waelkens, "From a Phrygian Quarry: Provenance of the Statues of the Dacian Prisoners in Trajan's Forum at Rome," *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 641-653, and, in the same issue, J.C. Fant, "Four Unfinished Sarcophagus Lids at Docimium and the Roman Imperial Quarry System in Phrygia," 655-662. See also P. Pensabene, "Osservazioni sulla diffusione dei marmi e il loro prezzo nella Roma imperiale," *DialAr*, ser. 3, 1, 1983, 53-63.

cavated entire cargoes of prefabricated sculpture and architecture.⁴⁶ The same patterns apply to sculpture in the round, and meaningful connections among areas of the Empire can be determined on the basis of replica-diffusion. Aphrodisias, with the incredible sculptural wealth it has yielded in the last twenty years of systematic excavation, will be at the forefront of such studies for years to come.⁴⁷

In Greek terms, distribution patterns are particularly meaningful during the Archaic period, for establishing preferences in architectural sculpture — for instance, continuous friezes predominate in Asia Minor, pedimental compositions on the Greek mainland, and metopes in Magna Graecia. Influences from one area to another can be established along such lines of diffusion, and are confirmed in the melting pots of the international sanctuaries.⁴⁸ The same approach is now being used for free-standing statuary, and regional trends seem increasingly important.⁴⁹

More obvious to the archaeologist than to the art historian is in fact the growing prominence being accorded to “provincial” production. The sculpture of Sicily and South Italy, both in stone and large-scale terracottas, and especially during the Archaic but also in the Hellenistic period, is now recognized as vital and original, rather than as purely derivative and almost primitive.⁵⁰ Influences from Etruria on Greek art are now detected and we no longer think in terms of a one-way street from Greece to Italy.⁵¹

Italic sculpture as a whole is acquiring new popularity, even if some of it may look grotesque and childish by classical standards; some of its “primitive” traits are instead being appreciated for their symbolism and vitality, and lack of naturalism and “correct” proportions is attributed to expressionism rather than incompetence.⁵² In this area, increasing attention is being focused on Sardinian sculpture — not only the intriguing *bronzetti* but, more recently, the life-size sandstone statues of warriors and pugilists from

Monte Prama tentatively dated to the seventh century B.C.⁵³ On the Italian mainland, in the Chieti Museum (a splendid example of museology at its best), masterpieces like the Capestrano Warrior are displayed within a didactic context that highlights not only the work of art but also its cultural world.⁵⁴ It may be noted in passing, within this sculptural discussion but with obviously much wider application, that museology has become a major contemporary concern, and that some small new museums in Italy and Greece now rival even those of the United States, which had pioneered in the concept of the teaching display.

If the art historian tends to focus on Italy and Greece, the archaeologist is keenly aware of other areas beyond the classical lands. Exciting discoveries at Obulco in Spain (modern Porcuna) can now be added to an increasing wealth of Neo-Hittite, Phoenician, Lycian, and Persian sculptures — to remain within the time span outlined at the beginning of this essay. It is becoming obvious that even Greek sculpture is vastly more meaningful if studied within a wider ancient context, and not only against the traditional backgrounds of Egyptian and Assyrian art.⁵⁵

Finally, a new caution in the use of ancient sources can be detected. Although we still rely heavily on what Roman authors said about Greek sculpture, we begin to perceive that most ancient writers interpreted the earlier evidence within the cultural framework of their own times. Although we are much further removed from Polykleitos, Pheidias, and Lysippos than Pliny, Plutarch, and Pausanias were, it is important to remember that they too lived and worked three- to five-hundred years after those sculptors' eras, belonged to a culture that lacked the excessive and precise documentation of modern times, and usually wrote for moralistic, rhetorical, or propagandistic purposes. Christian sources in particular can be seen as apologetic and biased, and it is becoming increasingly clear that ar-

⁴⁶ Besides the references cited supra, n. 45, see also J.B. Ward-Perkins and P. Throckmorton, “New Light on the Roman Marble Trade: The San Pietro Wreck,” *Archaeology*, xviii, 1965, 201-209.

⁴⁷ For replica diffusions, see Ridgway, *Roman Copies* (as in n. 22), 86-91, with references there cited. On Aphrodisias, see supra n. 29.

⁴⁸ See, e.g., M.Y. Goldberg, “Archaic Greek Akroteria,” *AJA*, lxxxvi, 1982, 193-217; N. Winter, “Archaic Architectural Terracottas Decorated with Human Heads,” *RömMitt*, lxxxv, 1978, 27-58; E. Fabbriotti, “Fregi fittili arcaici in Magna Grecia,” *AttiMGrecia*, xviii-xx, 1977-79, 149-170. For Magna Graecian metopes at Delphi, see G. Szeliga, *AJA*, xc, 1986, forthcoming.

⁴⁹ B. Barletta, for instance, is researching the diffusion of draped “kouroi”; for other regional studies see, e.g., J.G. Pedley, “A Group of Early Sixth Century Korai and the Workshop on Chios,” *AJA*, lxxxvi, 1982, 183-191. More difficult to follow is F. Croissant, *Les Protomés féminines archaïques*, Paris, 1983.

⁵⁰ See, most recently, V. Tusa, *La scultura in pietra di Selinunte*, Palermo, 1983; E. Ostby, “Il programma decorativo delle metope E di Selinunte,” *Magna Graecia*, xix, Nos. 9-10, 1984, 10-14. At a more general level, see R.R. Holloway, *Influences and Styles in the Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture of Sicily and Magna Graecia*, Louvain, 1975. For the Hellenistic period, see J.C. Carter, *The Sculpture of Taras*, Philadelphia, 1975.

⁵¹ In Italy, 1985 was “the Year of the Etruscans,” with a series of exhibitions

that will produce many new catalogues. At present, the most recent publication is *Gli Etruschi. Una nuova immagine*, Florence, 1984. M. Cristofani, *L'arte degli Etruschi. Produzione e consumo*, Turin, 1978, has been reprinted in 1985.

⁵² See, for instance, the catalogues of two exhibitions: *Prima Italia. L'arte italica del I millennio a.C.*, Rome, 1981; and *Enea nel Lazio: archeologia e mito*, Rome, 1981. See also E. Anati, *Le statue-stele della Lunigiana*, Milan, 1981; M.L. Nava, *Stele Daunie*, Florence, 1980; V. Cianfarani et al., *Culture adriatiche di Abruzzo e Molise*, Rome, 1978.

⁵³ See, e.g., C. Tronchetti, “Monte Prama,” *StEtr*, xlix, 1981, 525-27; G. Lilliu, *La civiltà nuragica*, Sassari, 1982, front cover et passim. See also C. Tronchetti in the forthcoming publication of the papers presented at the international colloquium, “Sardinia in the Mediterranean,” held at Tufts University, Sept. 23-25, 1983.

⁵⁴ On the Capestrano Warrior, beside Cianfarani (as in n. 52), see also D.K. Hill, “Early Italic Armor at Vassar College,” *AJA*, lxxxvi, 1982, 589-591. For views of the Chieti Museum and its displays, see the interview with its present director, Dr. G. Scichilone, in *Archeo. Attualità del passato*, II, April, 1985, 6-9.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., J.M. Blázquez and J. González Navarrete, “The Phokian Sculpture of Obulco in Southern Spain,” *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 61-69; W.A.P. Childs, *The City-Reliefs of Lycia*, Princeton, 1978. Indicative of this approach, although by now in need of updating, is K. Scheffold, *Die Griechen und ihre Nachbarn (Propyläen Kunstgeschichte)*, Berlin, 1967.

tistic terms changed meaning according to periods. One of the greatest dangers of modern research is in fact that of projecting back into the Greek past judgments and explanations given in the Roman period, under different cultural and administrative conditions.⁵⁶

In brief, if it may seem that Greek sculpture is producing the more exciting debates, Roman sculptural studies as a whole are acquiring a new dimension beyond the traditional focus on portraiture, sarcophagi, and historical reliefs.⁵⁷ The investigation may seem more archaeological (that is, philological, sociological, anthropological) than art-historical, but the results are bound to be significant for both fields.

Classical Architecture

Many of the trends highlighted above in the context of studies on ancient sculpture can be detected, too, in the context of architecture.⁵⁸ Fewer, by necessity, are the studies on individual architects, although they occur; but more general attempts are being made to identify working methods and architectural practices or styles.⁵⁹ In this field as well, "iconographic" concerns are apparent in the occasional monograph or article tracing the history, evolution, and meaning of a single building type. But temples are no longer the overriding focus and less prominent forms have come to the fore: stoas, prytaneia, gymnasia, baths.⁶⁰ In particular, from the purely architectural study of ancient

buildings, scholars have been turning increasingly to an integrated point of view, seeking to consider together structure, decoration, utilitarian function, and ideological intent.

In chronological terms, conceptions and boundaries are changing and expanding. The Dark Age — that is, the so-called Geometric period of the eighth century B.C. — is receiving greater illumination, as more buildings are uncovered and old ones are better understood.⁶¹ At the other end of the Greek spectrum, Hellenistic architecture is now receiving its just due, as obsolete notions of primitive beginnings, rapid growth and flourishing, and decadent ending are being excised from the most recent treatises. Surveys of periods rather than general studies are becoming popular, although we are still looking for an updated work of synthesis. By contrast, in Roman architecture, more books have become available in recent years, but primary concerns are for building materials and methods, rather than chronological and stylistic issues.⁶² Here perhaps dendrochronology could eventually provide the help that it is already extending to Byzantine churches and to mosques; wooden empolia and poloi from the Parthenon and the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion have already been tested.⁶³

As for stylistic trends, regional forms are acquiring importance with better understanding; the innovative and vigorous temples of Archaic Magna Graecia are perhaps at the forefront, thanks to the unexpected discoveries of Ionic "colossi" at Syracuse and Metapontum, but also thanks to

⁵⁶ A major contribution to the varying meanings of the word *xoanon* is A.A. Donohue, "Xoana," Ph.D. Diss., Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, 1984. Similar studies for the word *kolossos* have been made by G. Roux, *REA*, LXII, 1960, 5-40, and J. Servais, *AntCl*, xxxiv, 1965, 144-174. For the Hellenistic invention of anecdotes about 5th-century masters, see F. Preissshofen, *Jdl*, LXXXIX, 1974, 50-69. For the opinion that Plutarch gives a Roman interpretation of the role of Pheidias in the Parthenon, see N. Himmelmann in *Festgabe J. Straub (Bonn)bb*, Suppl. vol. xxxix, (1977), 67-90. See also F. Preissshofen and P. Zanker, *DialAr*, IV-V, 1970-71, 100-19. A good commentary on the ancient sources is offered by J.J. Pollitt as introduction to his two volumes in the series "Sources and Documents in the History of Art" mentioned infra, p. 20 (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1965 and 1966; *The Art of Rome* was reprinted in 1983). See also Pollitt's *The Ancient View of Greek Art. Criticism, History, and Terminology*, New Haven and London, 1974, with a veritable dictionary of aesthetic terms and their ancient meaning. For a good example of the problems created by a faulty transcription of an ancient text, see A. Linfert, *AthMitt*, LXXXIV, 1969, 158-164; yet he has not been able to convince many scholars that a Bithynian Doidalsas is a figment of textual emendation. It is also dangerous to assume that the spread of Christianity put an end to the sculptural reproduction of pagan subjects and mythological figures. See the Ganymede and the Eagle dated to the 5th century A.D. by E. Gazda in J.H. Humphrey, ed., *Excavations at Carthage 1977, Conducted by the University of Michigan*, VI, Ann Arbor, 1981, 125-178.

⁵⁷ On the other hand, even these traditional subjects continue to be studied intensively. For sarcophagi, see the review by P.P. Bober in *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984, 432-34, which summarizes the current state of research, with the publication of G. Koch and H. Sichtermann, *Römische Sarkophagi (Handbuch der Archäologie)*, Munich, 1982.

For historical reliefs, see the comprehensive listings provided by G.M. Koepfel, "Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit"; Part I, on the Julio-Claudian period, has appeared in *BonnJbb*, CLXXXIII, 1983, 61-144; Pt. II, on the Flavian Period, in *BonnJbb*, CLXXXIV, 1984, 1-65. Major contributions to various Roman monuments occur in the series edited by

H. Temporini, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW)*, Berlin, 1972 -.

⁵⁸ For Greek architecture, see the review by F. Winter, *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984, 103-06, as introduction to an issue of the journal devoted to architectural contributions; note also his "Tradition and Innovation in Doric Design," in four parts: I, *AJA*, LXXX, 1976, 139-145; II, *AJA*, LXXXII, 1978, 151-161; III, *AJA*, LXXXIV, 1980, 399-416; IV, *AJA*, LXXXVI, 1982, 387-400.

For Roman architecture, see, e.g., F. Sear, *Roman Architecture*, Ithaca, 1982, and its review by R. Ling in *AntJ*, LXIV, 1984, 155-56.

⁵⁹ For studies on architects, see, e.g., the famous book by J.A. Bundgaard, *Mnesicles: A Greek Architect at Work*, Copenhagen, 1957; for a most recent inquiry on the architects of the Parthenon, see, e.g., B. Wesenberg, "Wer erbaute den Parthenon?" *AthMitt*, xcvi, 1982, 99-125.

Working methods and practices: A. Burford, *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidaurus*, Toronto, 1969; J.J. Coulton, *Ancient Greek Architects at Work*, Ithaca, 1977; J.P. Adam, *La construction romaine. Matériaux et techniques*, Paris, 1984, reviewed by J.P. Oleson, *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 538-39.

⁶⁰ Stoas: J.J. Coulton, *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa*, Oxford, 1976.

Prytaneia: S. Miller, *The Prytaneion*, London, 1978.

Gymnasia: J. Delorme, *Gymnasion*, Paris, 1960.

Baths: R. Ginouvès, *Balaneutike*, Paris, 1962; E. Brödner, *Die römische Thermen und das antike Badewesen*, Darmstadt, 1983.

⁶¹ For the most recent publications on Geometric architecture, see H. Lauter, *Lathuresa, Beiträge zur Architektur und Siedlungsgeschichte in spätgeometrischer Zeit*, Mainz, 1984, with bibliog.; A. Mallwitz, *ASAtene*, LIX, n.s. XLII, 1981, publ. 1983, 81-96.

⁶² See supra nn. 58-59.

⁶³ P.I. Kuniholm and C.L. Striker, "Dendrochronological Investigations in the Aegean," *JFA*, x, 1983, 411-420; see 414, n. 8, for reference to Byzantine research, and 417 for the testing of the classical empolia. See also abstract in *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984, 250.

major new studies of well-known monuments.⁶⁴ The architecture of the Cyclades during the sixth and fifth centuries is still being investigated and has so far been published only in a series of articles,⁶⁵ but it can be predicted to make a definite impact on our conceptions of Greek building forms when properly summarized in a book. It has recently been suggested, in fact, that Cycladic influence (together with some from Magna Graecia) played a role in the shaping of the Parthenon.⁶⁶

This famous building, by the way, can still present surprises in its structure, not just its sculptural embellishment: restoration work has attributed to the Parthenon a fragmentary window sill that leads to the postulation of high openings in the east door-wall, to light the aisles.⁶⁷

Among regional styles, Macedonian architecture is now known to have had an idiom of its own, and recent discoveries not only of tombs but also of palaces are attracting increasing attention.⁶⁸ In the wake of Macedonian expansion, certain architectural forms are seen to spread, including the arch and vault.⁶⁹ As Alexander and the Diadochoi, then the Romans, brought war to distant territories, the arts of attack and defense developed, and fortifications became works of art in themselves, worthy of the several studies and monographs devoted to them in recent times.⁷⁰

I also should single out a renewed interest in urban studies, not only in terms of city planning but from a sociological and occasionally even anthropological point of view.⁷¹ Excavation and, quite often, aerial photography of colonial sites have revealed many early examples of orthogonal layouts, and various theories have been advanced

about the possible contribution of Hippodamos to town plans, as conveniently summarized in the recent work by E. Greco and M. Torelli, *Storia dell'urbanistica. Il mondo greco* (Rome-Bari, 1983).

Topographical studies retain a major position within architectural research, and can have a bearing on art-historical matters when location influences identification of specific buildings, as the already mentioned case of the so-called Hephaisteion. Another example of considerable importance is that of the Erechtheion on the Athenian Akropolis, which has recently been given a different inner plan and even a different name on the basis of epigraphic and literary evidence.⁷²

Worth noting, finally, is the recent interest in the *anastylosis* or even total reconstruction of ancient monuments, in order to promote a better understanding of their spatial extent and visual effect — for instance, the impressive Roman Marble Court at Sardis.⁷³ Some of these structures are even used for practical current purposes, like the performances in the theater at Epidaurus, and the museum in the Stoa of Attalos of the Athenian Agora. When restoration or reconstruction is not feasible, plastic models give an effective idea of ancient buildings and sites, and are being increasingly used.⁷⁴

Paintings and Mosaics

Certainly to be counted among the major arts is monumental painting, which unfortunately is poorly represented among ancient remains. Here too, however, some new finds have expanded our evidence: not only many more

⁶⁴ See D. Mertens, "Der ionische Tempel von Metapont: ein Zwischenbericht," *RömMitt*, lxxxvi, 1979, 103-139; also his "Magna Graecia e Italia Centrale — note su parallelità strutturali nell'architettura arcaica," in *Studi in onore di Dinu Adamesteanu*, Matera, 1980 (*non vidi*); and, most important, his *Der Tempel von Segesta und die dorische Tempelbaukunst des griechischen Westens in klassischer Zeit* (*RömMitt*, Beiheft vi, 1984).

⁶⁵ G. Gruben, "Naxos und Paros. Vierter vorläufiger Bericht über die Forschungskampagnen 1972-1982. II," *AA*, 1982, 621-689, with previous bibliog. (Pt. I is on pp. 159-195). See also the contributions by A. Ohnesorg (pp. 271-290), M. Schuller (pp. 231-244; 245-264), and K. Schnieringer (pp. 265-270) in the same volume, on the Doric architecture of Paros.

⁶⁶ J.J. Coulton, "The Parthenon and Periklean Doric," pp. 40-44, and M. Korres, "Der Pronaos und die Fenster des Parthenon," pp. 47-54, both make this suggestion in *Parthenon-Kongress* (as in n. 16).

⁶⁷ Korres.

⁶⁸ Stella G. Miller, "The Philippeion and Macedonian Hellenistic Architecture," *AthMitt*, lxxxviii, 1973, 189-218; and "Macedonian Tombs: Their Architecture and Architectural Decoration," in B. Barr-Sharrar and E.N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (*Studies in the History of Art*, x), Washington, D.C., 1982.

Besides the Palace at Vergina, the recent discovery of one at Pella, of the second half of the 4th century B.C., so far only known through newspaper accounts, has been briefly mentioned in *Archeo*, vi, August, 1985, 4.

⁶⁹ T.D. Boyd, "The Arch and the Vault in Greek Architecture," *AJA*, lxxxii, 1978, 83-100.

⁷⁰ F. Winter, *Greek Fortifications*, Toronto, 1971; A. Lawrence, *Greek Aims in Fortifications*, Oxford, 1980; J. Ober, *Fortress Attica* (*Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 84), Leiden, 1985; A. McNicoll and T. Winikoff, "A Hel-

lenistic Fortress in Lycia — The Isian Tower?" *AJA*, lxxxvii, 1983, 311-323; J. Ober, "Two Ancient Watchtowers above Aigosthena in the Northern Megarid," *AJA*, lxxxvii, 1983, 387-392. It is regrettable that the most intriguing fortification of the ancient world, the Euryalos Castle at Syracuse, has not yet received monographic treatment after the latest discoveries; cf. *FA*, xiv, 1959, 173, No. 2602; also F.E. Winter, *AJA*, lxxvii, 1963, 363-387.

⁷¹ See, e.g., *Architecture et société de l'archaïsme grec à la République romaine. Actes du colloque de Rome, 2-4 Décembre 1980*, Rome, 1983, esp. the introductory essay by P. Gros, and the review by W.J. Chérif, *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 367-68. Cf. also *Città e architettura* (as in n. 38), and the spring 1985 exhibition in Bologna, "The Growth and Structure of the City in Emilia Romagna," as announced in *AJA*, lxxxviii, 1984, 546.

⁷² For topographical studies of Athens, an important contribution has been J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, New York, 1971, patterned after E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London, 1961, 1962; see Travlos, s.v., for a different interior arrangement of the Erechtheion, and K. Jeppesen, "Where was the so-called Erechtheion?" *AJA*, lxxxiii, 1979, 381-394, updated in "Further Inquiries on the Location of the Erechtheion and Its Relationship to the Temple of the Polias," *AJA*, lxxxvii, 1983, 325-333. According to Jeppesen, the building at present going under the Erechtheion name should instead be solely the Temple of Athena.

On the Hephaisteion, see, most recently, W.F. Wyatt, Jr. and C.N. Edmonson, *AJA*, lxxxviii, 1984, 135-167; on its identification, see n. 20.

⁷³ G.M.A. Hanfmann et al., *Sardis, from Prehistoric to Roman Times*, Cambridge, MA, and London, 1983, 152-53, figs. 211, 222-24.

⁷⁴ See, e.g., W. Voigtländer, "Zur Topographie Milets. Ein neues Modell zur antiken Stadt," *AA*, 1985, 77-91.

examples from Etruscan and even Paestan and Lucanian tombs,⁷⁵ but also two, unexpected, from late sixth- and early fifth-century Lycia, which bear some surprising affinities with Etruscan murals.⁷⁶ The unusually well-preserved villa at Oplontis (modern Torre Annunziata, near Naples) has confirmed suspicions that Mau's first-to-fourth styles of wall decoration do not follow in strict chronological sequence, but may coexist for structural effects, the heavier, more truly architectural second style forming the base, as it were, for a third-style upper register in a grand hall over one story high.⁷⁷

Perhaps the most important finds come from Macedonia: tomb interiors decorated with enormous, carnivorous-looking flowers that recall the paintings of Hieronymus Bosch and, perhaps most notorious now, the large hunting scene in the "attic" of the so-called Tomb of Philip, with its foreshortened horse and purple hills vanishing in the distance.⁷⁸

The disappearance of painting remains one of the most grievous losses from the classical past, but gaps are being filled, and theoretical studies have increased in number. We are beginning to discern, as in sculpture, subjects that may derive from Greek prototypes and others that are specifically Roman or at least Italic/Magna Graecian in content and iconography.⁷⁹ Technical consideration of actual paintings and further scrutiny of the ancient sources have resulted in a better understanding of the latter, and much more work remains to be done in this direction, which is likely to highlight, as in other fields, fruitful interaction between Greeks and Romans during the Hellenistic period, again with influences moving in either direction.⁸⁰

Macedonia has been productive in mosaic finds as well, one of them signed by a hitherto unknown master. The elaborate floral borders of these floor mosaics have sug-

gested contacts with Sikyon and its own famous florals, while the figured scenes have provided technical information on the transition from pebbles to tesserae (at Pella, with the addition of terracotta pieces and lead strips).⁸¹ Motya and Benghazi have also produced evidence at the early end of the chronological range, while the vast tapestry of the floors in the Villa at Piazza Armerina, Sicily, has exemplified production in the early fourth century of the Roman Empire, with clear contacts between Sicily and African mosaic workshops.⁸² The study of mosaics has come into its own, through the foundation of the Association Internationale pour l'Étude de la Mosaique Antique (AIEMA), international colloquia, an intensive publication of North African mosaics, and compilation of other regional *corpora*.⁸³ Shorter works on individual examples have pointed out literary allusions and an amusing case of commercial propaganda on the floor of a *garum* merchant at Pompeii.⁸⁴

Vase Painting and Pottery

This field — virtually limited to Greek/Magna Graecian and Etruscan production, with only Terra Sigillata wares qualifying as art for the Roman period — has become so specialized as to be almost the exclusive province of the classical archaeologist or iconographer. At an advanced level, few even among the archaeologists can communicate intelligently; yet the information to be derived from vases is of increasing importance to all, now that more and different questions are being asked of the material, and the Morellian connoisseurship involved in recognizing hands and formulating attributions should certainly be relevant for the art historian.

In very broad terms, two general trends can be detected, both long-lived but both expanding in new directions: the

⁷⁵ For a recent publication of an Etruscan tomb, see, e.g., S. Stopponi, *La Tomba della "Scrofa Nera,"* Rome, 1983; for Paestan tombs, see M. Napoli, *La Tomba del Tuffatore. La scoperta della grande pittura greca,* Bari, 1970.

⁷⁶ M.J. Mellink, "Notes on Anatolian Wall Painting," in *Mélanges Mansel*, Ankara, 1974, 537-547; and "Local, Phrygian, and Greek Traits in Northern Lycia," *RA*, 1976, 21-34.

⁷⁷ A. De Franciscis, *The Pompeian Wall Paintings in the Roman Villa of Oplontis*, Recklinghausen, 1975; for debate over Mau's sequence, see R. Winkes, *Roman Paintings and Mosaics*, Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, 1982, esp. 9-22; or P. von Blanckenhagen, review in *AJA*, lxxxvi, 1982, 307-08. For Roman Paintings, "after Pompeii," see H. Joyce, *The Decoration of Walls, Ceilings and Floors in Italy in the Second and Third Centuries A.D.*, Rome, 1981.

⁷⁸ Macedonian Tomb with flowers: K. Rhomiopoulou, "A New Monumental Chamber Tomb with Paintings of the Hellenistic Period near Lefkadia (West Macedonia)," *AAA*, vi, 1, 1973, 87-92 and front cover.

For the best illustrations of the paintings from the "Tomb of Philip" see M. Andronikos, *Vergina: The Royal Tombs and the Ancient City*, Athens, 1984. On the issue of the tomb's ownership, see e.g., the controversy in *AJA*, as summarized in the editorial note on p. 99, *AJA*, lxxxvii, 1983.

⁷⁹ See, e.g., K.M. Phillips, Jr., "Perseus and Andromeda," *AJA*, lxxii, 1968, 1-23; P. von Blanckenhagen, "The Odyssey Frieze," *RömMitt*, lxx, 1963, 100-146.

⁸⁰ V.J. Bruno, *Hellenistic Painting Techniques. The Evidence of the Delos Fragments*, Leiden, 1985, and *Form and Color in Greek Painting*, New

York, 1977; also "The Painted Metopes at Lefkadia and the Problem of Color in Doric Sculptured Metopes," *AJA*, lxxxv, 1981, 3-11. Professor Bruno is now working on a comparative study of Greek and Romano-Campanian painting techniques as seen in Delos and Pompeii. In the *Mnemosyne* Supplement series, see Vols. lxxv and lxxvii, by P.G. Maxwell-Stuart, *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology* (1981).

⁸¹ On the Pella mosaics, see, e.g., M. Robertson, "Early Greek Mosaics," in *Macedonia and Greece* (as in n. 68). See also D. Salzmann, *Untersuchungen zu den antiken Kieselmosaiken von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Tessera-Technik*, Berlin, 1982, and review by J.J. Pollitt, *AJA*, lxxxviii, 1984, 85-86.

⁸² A. Carandini et al., *Filosofiana. The Villa of Piazza Armerina*, Palermo, 1982; R.J.A. Wilson, "Roman Mosaics in Sicily: The African Connection," *AJA*, lxxxvi, 1982, 413-428.

⁸³ For a review of the current situation in mosaic studies, see K.M.D. Dunbabin, *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 535-536 (review of *Mosaique. Recueil d'hommage à Henri Stern*, Paris, 1983). See also *AJA*, lxxxiii, 3, 1979, for an issue entirely devoted to mosaic studies, which includes a catalogue of Roman mosaics in Greece (by S.E. Waywell). A *Corpus des Mosaiques de Tunisie* is being published, in installments, by M.A. Alexander, and many others, equally regional, are in progress.

⁸⁴ Literary allusion: H. Whitehouse, "Shipwreck on the Nile: A Greek Novel on a 'Lost' Roman Mosaic?" *AJA*, lxxxix, 1985, 129-134.

Garum merchant: R.I. Curtis, "A Personalized Floor Mosaic from Pompeii," *AJA*, lxxxviii, 1984, 557-566.

study of painters and their oeuvres, and that of iconography — the first focusing on techniques and styles, the second on content and inherent message.⁸⁵

Under the first heading, the work of attributing vases to painters, especially in the case of new finds, continues along the lines established by Sir John D. Beazley, although perhaps not quite with the same authoritative impact. From the classical period of Black-Figure and Red-Figure Attic vases, the practice has spread to earlier times — seventh-century B.C. Proto-Attic, eighth-century Geometric⁸⁶ — and other geographic areas — Corinthian, Laconian, Boiotian, for example.⁸⁷ Magna Graecian vases — South Italian, Lucanian, Campanian — are being systematically published and authoritatively attributed by Arthur Trendall and Alexander Cambitoglou.⁸⁸

Types of wares and related objects are also being studied anew and attributed: Caeretan hydriai and Clazomenian sarcophagi, for instance, or White-ground lekythoi and bilingual vases.⁸⁹ Another productive line of inquiry has been the monographic treatment of a single shape,⁹⁰ and a few books are still being written on the individual major painter.⁹¹

Almost inevitably connected with connoisseurship and attributions, in certain cases, are studies that explore the oeuvre of a master in order to detect trends, interests, and political affiliations. Yet by and large the iconographic approach seems separate from the attributive and it is the rare scholar who encompasses both. Of the two, the iconographic one appears more productive of new insights and fresh results in our investigation of the past. The attempt

to correlate subjects and contemporary politics, ably spearheaded by John Boardman,⁹² has found many followers but also a few dissenters and should certainly be made with due caution.⁹³ A structuralist approach, largely promoted by French scholars,⁹⁴ looks for core images as eternal symbols with universal application, and therefore tries to interpret Greek vases on almost anthropological grounds, with limited success. More traditionally iconographic studies correlate images and extant literary sources, or derive lost versions and even popular conceptions from the specific rendering of certain subjects on vases.⁹⁵ It is becoming increasingly clear that scenes on Attic vases that used to be considered depictions of daily life may instead have an epic or mythological content.⁹⁶ Other representations have a direct bearing on specific cults and rituals.⁹⁷

Both connoisseurship and iconographic studies have been greatly helped, it should be noted, by two recent developments. One is the above-mentioned initiative of the LIMC, which is promoting national gathering centers of information in each of the participating countries, with a major documentation pool at Basel. The other is the opening to scholars of the Beazley Archive with its computerized system of references to new publications, and its systematic addition of vases not listed in Beazley's *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters*, *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*, and *Paralipomena*.⁹⁸

A more strictly archaeological, less art-historical approach, but one very important for our understanding of ancient culture, is that which studies vases as objects of export and trade and, whenever possible, as workshop pro-

⁸⁵ See C.G. Boulter, "The Study of Greek Vases," as introduction to *AJA*, LXXXV, 2, 1981, an issue devoted to vase painting contributions.

⁸⁶ Proto-Attic: S.P. Morris, *The Black and White Style. Athens and Aigina in the Orientalizing Period*, New Haven, 1984 — e.g., the Polyphemus Painter, the Ram Jug Painter.

Geometric: e.g., J.N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery*, London, 1969 — the Birdseed Painter, the Vulture Painter.

⁸⁷ Corinthian: P. Lawrence, *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984, 59-64; D.A. Amyx, *Corinthian Vase-Painting of the Archaic Period* (forthcoming) — The Cavalcade Painter, the Medallion Painter.

Laconian: C.M. Stibbe, *Lakonische Vasenmaler der sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, London, 1972; G.P. Schaus, *AJA*, LXXXIII, 1979, 102-06 — the Naucratis Painter, the Boreads Painter.

Boiotian: K. Kilinski, *AJA*, LXXXII, 1978, 173-191 — the Painter of Boston 01.8110; the Painter of Heidelberg 166.

⁸⁸ See, e.g., A.D. Trendall and A. Cambitoglou, *The Red-Figure Vases of Apulia*, Oxford, 1978, and *First Supplement* (BICS Suppl. 42, 1983).

⁸⁹ Caeretan Hydriai: J.M. Hemelrijk, *Caeretan Hydriai (Kerameus, v)*, Mainz, 1984.

Clazomenian sarcophagi: R.M. Cook, *Clazomenian Sarcophagi*, Mainz, 1981.

White ground lekythoi: D.C. Kurtz, *Athenian White Lekythoi: Patterns and Painters*, Oxford, 1975.

Bilingual vases: B. Cohen, *Attic Bilingual Vases and Their Painters*, New York, 1978.

⁹⁰ S. Drougou, *Der attische Psykter*, Würzburg, 1975; B. Borell, *Attisch geometrische Schalen*, Mainz, 1978; S.R. Roberts, *The Attic Pyxis*, Chicago, 1978.

⁹¹ See, e.g., the entire *Kerameus* series, ed. J. Boardman and H.A. Cahn, and published by P. von Zabern in Mainz, which is planned to include monographs on vase painters or classes of pottery, as a continuation of J.D. Beazley and P. Jacobsthal's *Bilder griechischer Vasen* series. Among the recent publications are E. Böhr, *Der Schaukelmaler (Kerameus, IV)*, 1982, and, in another series, G. Bakir, *Sophilos. Ein Beitrag zu seinem Stil*, Mainz, 1981.

⁹² See e.g., J. Boardman, "Exekias," *AJA*, LXXXII, 1978, 1-25, with previous bibliography.

⁹³ For other articles by Boardman, and contributions by both followers and dissenters, see W.G. Moon, "The Priam Painter: Some Iconographic and Stylistic Considerations," in *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (as in n. 13), 97-118, esp. n. 12. And, e.g., H.A. Shapiro, "Herakles and Kyknos," *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984, 523-29.

⁹⁴ See, e.g., *La cité des images. Religion et société en Grèce antique*, Lausanne, 1984, and esp. the preface by J.-P. Vernant and the postface by C. Bérard, on the difficulties of the task.

⁹⁵ See, e.g., J.M. Moret, *L'Ilioupersis dans la céramique italienne*, Geneva, 1975.

⁹⁶ E.g., G.F. Pinney, "Achilles Lord of Scythia," in *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (as in n. 13), 127-146; J. Neils, "The Group of the Negro Alabastra: A Study in Motif Transference," *AntK*, XXIII, 1980, 13-23.

⁹⁷ See, e.g., L.G. Kahil, "Mythological Repertoire of Brauron," in *Ancient Greek Art* (as in n. 13), 231-244, with previous bibliography.

⁹⁸ For the LIMC, see above n. 12. For the Beazley Archive, see the announcement in *AJA*, LXXXVII, 2, 1983, unpagged end section.

duction.⁹⁹ Connections between Samos and Naucratis, Sparta and Cyrene, have been highlighted by percentages of finds of Laconian pottery by certain painters at the sites.¹⁰⁰ This type of inquiry is particularly valuable for the Archaic period, but can be of importance in later times as well and give some idea of interrupted (or uninterrupted) contacts during wars or depressed conditions.¹⁰¹ Technical studies have clarified firing methods and temperatures — to the extent that forgeries or “repainting” of Black- and Red-Figure vases are now increasingly possible — and clay analyses may eventually settle matters of provenience and place of manufacture.¹⁰² The computer is also greatly facilitating the tasks of classification and the recording of distribution.

Roman wares, being mostly plain, rarely are of interest to the art historian, but Terra Sigillata, with its varied yet standardized repertoire of decorative patterns and figures, may provide unexpected bonuses, besides its obvious chronological value. Exemplary in this respect is the study by Maria Teresa Marabini Moevs that utilizes Terra Sigillata fragments depicting Muses and actors to explain problems of Roman topography and cult, to throw light on Greek statuary carried off to Rome from Ambrakia, and to draw chronological conclusions that have relevance for Hellenistic and Classicizing sculptural styles.¹⁰³

Minor Arts and Other Subjects

It is impossible to treat the topic of minor arts with any-

thing approaching comprehensive coverage. No two scholars, moreover, would agree on what properly constitutes minor arts. In addition, representations in the minor arts, be they terracotta figurines, bronze appliquéés, or ivory carvings, can often be used to throw light on the major arts.¹⁰⁴

The spectacular finds of bronze and silver vessels in the Macedonian tombs, together with exquisite gold jewelry, have shown us the wide-ranging contacts of this monarchical area forming a stylistic bridge between East and West.¹⁰⁵ The Derveni Krater — which, at approximately one meter in height, can hardly be considered minor — will provide iconographic speculation for years to come.¹⁰⁶ With regard to Roman relief ware, Greek versus Roman philosophical content has been discussed in connection with the Berthouville scyphi.¹⁰⁷ The Farnese sardonix cup has been the subject of a recent monograph, without solving its iconographic (and chronological?) puzzle to everybody's satisfaction.¹⁰⁸ The study of gems has taken renewed impetus with Marie Louise Vollenweider's catalogues of Roman examples and John Boardman's research on Greek island gems.¹⁰⁹

Art-historical methods and stylistic analysis are being applied to prehistoric objects,¹¹⁰ expanding the chronological limits of the “classical” world well back into the second millennium B.C. The Thera frescoes can claim a legitimate place in it.¹¹¹

An important new development, which has produced

⁹⁹ See, e.g., A.W. Johnston, *Trademarks on Greek Vases*, Warminster, 1979. I. Scheibler, *Griechische Töpferkunst. Herstellung, Handel und Gebrauch der antiken Tongefässe*, Munich, 1983. For work in progress, see J.H. Oakley, “An Athenian Red-figure Workshop from the Time of the Peloponnesian War,” paper presented at the 73rd College Art Association Meeting in Los Angeles, CA, on Feb. 16, 1985.

¹⁰⁰ See e.g., M.S. Venit, “Laconian Black Figure in Egypt,” *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 391-398; also Schaus (as in n. 87; under Laconian); R.M. Cook, “Archaic Greek Trade: Three Conjectures. 2. The Distribution of Laconian Pottery,” *JHS*, xcix, 1979, 153-54.

¹⁰¹ See, e.g., S. Herbert, *Corinth VII, IV, The Red-Figure Pottery*, ASCSA, Princeton, 1977; B.R. MacDonald, “The Emigration of Potters from Athens in the Late Fifth Century B.C.,” *AJA*, LXXXV, 1981, 159-168.

¹⁰² See, most recently, J.V. Noble, “Refiring Greek Vases,” *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 515-16; for a recent application of neutron activation analysis to pottery studies, see J. Genneweg, I. Perlman, and J. Yellin, *The Provenience, Typology and Chronology of Eastern Terra Sigillata*, Jerusalem, 1983, review by S. Herbert in *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 365-67.

¹⁰³ M.T. Marabini Moevs, “Le Muse di Ambracia,” *BdA*, XII, 1981, 1-58.

¹⁰⁴ See, e.g., E.R. Williams, “A Terracotta Herakles at the Johns Hopkins University,” *Hesperia*, LI, 1982, 357-364; B. Barr-Sharrar, “The Anticythera Fulcrum Bust: A Portrait of Arsinoë III,” *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 689-692; G. Becatti, “Opere d'arte greca nella Roma di Tiberio,” *ArchCl*, xxv-xxvi, 1973-74, 18-53 (on an ivory diptych reflecting large-scale statuary).

¹⁰⁵ On vessels from Macedonian tombs, see B. Barr-Sharrar in *Macedonia and Greece* (as in n. 68), 122-139, and in the same volume (pp. 140-151), R.A. Higgins on jewelry. For links with East and West, see M. Pfrommer, “Grossgriechischer und mittellitalischer Einfluss in der Rankenornamentik frühhellenistischer Zeit,” *JdI*, xcvi, 1982, 119-190, and “Italien-Makedonien-Kleinasien. Interdependenzen spätklassischer und frühhellenis-

tischer Toreutik,” *JdI*, xcvi, (1983), 235-285; Barr-Sharrar, *ArchNews*, XIII, 1984, 1-12.

On jewelry in general, see T. Hackens, *Classical Jewelry*, Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, 1976; Stella G. Miller, *Two Groups of Thessalian Gold (University of California Publications in Classical Studies, xviii)*, Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1979.

¹⁰⁶ For a summary of the theories up to 1982, see Ridgway, “Court Art and Hellenistic Art: The Role of Alexander the Great,” *ArchNews*, XI, 1982, 43-58, esp. nn. 20-29; the monographic publication is E. Youri, *Ho Krateras tou Derveniou* (in Greek, Athens, 1978).

¹⁰⁷ J. Van de Grift, “Tears and Revel: The Allegory of the Berthouville Centaur Scyphi,” *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984, 377-388.

¹⁰⁸ E. La Rocca, *L'età d'oro di Cleopatra. Indagine sulla Tazza Farnese*, Rome, 1984; see also the review, by J. Van de Grift, *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 711-12.

¹⁰⁹ For Vollenweider's latest contribution, see *Deliciae Leonis. Antike geschnittene Steine und Ringe aus einer Privatsammlung*, Mainz, 1984; a major contribution is also P. Zazoff, *Die antiken Gemmen (Handbuch der Archäologie)*, Munich, 1983. Zazoff is also the editor of the series *Antiken Gemmen in deutschen Sammlungen* which has just been completed in five volumes. For J. Boardman's latest contribution, see his “Greek Gem Engraving: Archaic to Classical,” in Boulter, *Greek Art* (as in n. 8), 83-95.

¹¹⁰ See, e.g., J. Hurwit, “The Dendra Octopus Cup and the Problem of Style in the Fifteenth Century Aegean,” *AJA*, LXXXIII, 1979, 413-426; P. Betancourt et al., *East Cretan White-on-Dark Ware*, Philadelphia, 1984, reviewed by G. Walberg, *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 530-31.

¹¹¹ Thera frescoes: see, e.g., Ellen N. Davis, “The Iconography of the Ship Fresco from Thera,” in *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (as in n. 13), 3-14.

several valuable publications, is that of the museum loan exhibition built around a specific theme, and often spawning related symposia which add their contribution to the fresh insights of the ad-hoc catalogue. Typical examples in recent years are the many exhibitions on Alexander the Great organized by various American museums, which utilized important loans from Greece to complement a display of their own related holdings.¹¹² Other notable instances are the exhibitions "The Vatican Collections. The Papacy and Art," "Age of Spirituality," and "Greek Art of the Aegean Islands," to mention only a few that have recently taken place in this country with material sent from abroad.¹¹³ Equally useful are those drawing from private or semi-private collections in the United States, which often prompt the first scholarly publication of unpublished pieces.¹¹⁴ Major exhibitions abroad have resulted in outstanding treatments of little-known materials and subjects.¹¹⁵ In addition, several major European museums are rearranging their galleries and publishing new comprehensive catalogues which offer the opportunity for considerable revisions and updating of theories. Such catalogues, moreover, are often collaborative projects by many scholars, each with his or her own specialty, rather than the monumental effort of single writers as in the past.¹¹⁶ We may also note that classical art is now reaching less traditional markets, as shown for instance by the recent publication of the holdings of a Japanese museum.¹¹⁷

Symposia are becoming increasingly frequent, even without being connected with special exhibitions.¹¹⁸ The resultant publications are often quite important, but generally uneven in treatment, as each contributor interprets the given theme with some latitude. In the long run, these occasional works create bibliographical problems, since it is difficult to trace and consult items of interest more or less hidden under generic titles, and often without an official editor. The same stricture applies to *Festschriften*, especially when only ties of friendship rather than guidelines on subject matter link the various contributions. Yet these gratulatory or commemorative works, often in more than one volume, have become frequent and require special at-

ention.¹¹⁹ The Acts of the International Congresses of Classical Archaeology often include many papers of value for art history that are lost to the more general practitioner.¹²⁰

Since these last comments refer primarily to trends in publication, rather than to specific subfields of ancient art, I may add a few words about theoretical and philosophical writings on a more general level, especially considering their scarcity. Global attempts at visualizing cyclical or linear developments of ancient art are no longer popular, and I can only cite, from relatively recent years, Robert Scranton's *Aesthetic Aspects of Ancient Art* (Chicago and London, 1964), or J. Benson's translation (*On the Meaning of Greek Statues*, Amherst, 1980) of E. Buschor's *Vom Sinn der griechischer Standbilder* (Berlin, 1942), both works of greater compass than the classical world, despite their titles.¹²¹

More specifically dealing with that world has been J.J. Pollitt's research, which stems from a solid knowledge of the ancient writers, as shown by his prefaces to *The Art of Greece 1400-31 B.C.* and *The Art of Rome c.753 B.C.-337 A.D.* Of lasting value is his *Art and Experience in Classical Greece* (Cambridge, 1972), and also notable is his intelligent preface to the expanded version of Otto Brendel, *Prolegomena to the Study of Roman Art* (New Haven and London, 1979). Stimulating comments can be found in R. Carpenter's *Greek Sculpture, A Critical Review* (Chicago, 1960), and *Greek Art, A Study of the Formal Evolution of Style* (Philadelphia, 1962).

More openly written from a sociological or political point of view are several European works that cannot be properly acknowledged. I shall only mention R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Introduzione all'archeologia classica come storia dell'arte antica* (Rome and Bari, 1976); A. Carandini, *Archeologia e cultura materiale. Dai "lavori senza gloria" nell'antichità a una politica dei beni culturali* (Bari, 1979); and, on a more specific point, the introduction by F. Coarelli, as editor, to *Artisti e artigiani in Grecia. Guida storica e critica* (Bari, 1980). Other general treatments focus on later attitudes toward the past and try to explain our own (emotional?) reactions to classical works of art. Most meaningful in this

¹¹² To the basic catalogue, *The Search for Alexander*, for the exhibition held in Washington, D.C., which produced the occasion for the symposium on *Macedonia and Greece* (as in n. 68), individual supplements were added by the museums in Chicago, Boston, San Francisco, New Orleans, and the Metropolitan Museum (New York, Oct. 27, 1982, to Jan. 3, 1983).

¹¹³ *The Vatican Collections. The Papacy and Art*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1982; K. Weitzmann, ed., *Age of Spirituality*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1979, and *Age of Spirituality. A Symposium*, Princeton, NJ, 1980; *Greek Art of the Aegean Islands*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1979.

¹¹⁴ E.g., W.G. Moon, *Greek Vase-Painting in Midwestern Collections*, Chicago, 1979; H.A. Shapiro, *Art, Myth and Culture: Greek Vases from Southern Collections*, New Orleans, 1981; G.F. Pinney and B.S. Ridgway, *Aspects of Ancient Greece*, exh. cat., Allentown, 1979.

¹¹⁵ See *Prima Italia* and *Enea nel Lazio* (as in n. 52), for example.

¹¹⁶ Most notable is the series of catalogues being published by A. Giu'liano for the *Museo Nazionale Romano (Sculture, I, 1-8, 1981-84 so far)*, which includes also a section on paintings (Series II), one on terracottas (III),

and one on bronzes (IV). Various German museums are doing the same. Immensely helpful for research so far is the fourth edition of W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*, supervised by H. Speier, with the collaboration of E. Simon, H. von Steuben et al.; Tübingen, I: 1963; II: 1966; III: 1969; IV: 1972.

¹¹⁷ E. Simon, *The Kurashiki Ninagawa Museum. Greek, Etruscan and Roman Antiquities*, Mainz, 1982.

¹¹⁸ See, e.g., Moon's frequently cited *Ancient Greek Art* (as in n. 13) and Boulter, *Greek Art* (as in n. 8).

¹¹⁹ See, e.g., *Philiás Charin. Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni*, Rome, 1980, in six volumes which cost 1,000,000 lira! or the monumental *Stele, A Volume in Memory of N. Kontoleon*, Athens, 1980, with 621 pages and 270 plates.

¹²⁰ See, e.g., those of the Eleventh Congress held in London in 1978, or those of the Twelfth held in Athens in 1983.

¹²¹ Because of its vaster scope, I may also mention here P. Fehl, *The Classical Monument, Reflections on the Connection between Morality and Art in Greek and Roman Sculpture*, New York, 1972.

respect is N. Himmelmann's *Utopische Vergangenheit. Archäologie und moderne Kultur* (Berlin, 1976), which has been translated into Italian and published with a helpful preface by S. Settis.¹²² More specifically addressed to the collecting tendencies of the last four centuries is the valuable catalogue of "masterpieces" by F. Haskell and N. Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900* (New Haven and London, 1981).

Written from a more personal viewpoint and quite different from the standard textbooks are two major surveys, of Greek and Roman art, by Martin Robertson and Rannuccio Bianchi Bandinelli respectively.¹²³ Other recent publications by subjects or by periods, in use in paperback in many of our classrooms, need not be cited in this context, except to rejoice that so many outstanding photographs of ancient monuments (especially those by A. Frantz and M. Hirmer) are now available to our students.

Some Reflections on Current Practices

In the main section of this survey I have tried to temper my personal preferences with as much objectivity as I could muster. I shall now indulge in a few comments of my own, which are unabashedly subjective and even critical of current trends in art-historical studies of ancient art.

I must begin by reiterating that a fundamental difference exists between archaeologists and art historians, but this difference is beginning to appear even within the ranks of archaeologists, separating the excavators and the anthropologically inclined from the "traditional," i.e., art-historical students of the past. The former are often slightly patronizing or even somewhat impatient with the latter, considering them old-fashioned. On the other hand, "pure" classicists (i.e., philologists) and "true" art historians (those who deal with ancient art only as a short beginning in a long cultural sequence) do not recognize them as their kin, thinking them too limited or too object-bound.¹²⁴

I have been personally fortunate to spend my professional life so far in an institution where ancient art is taught within a large department of Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology, as independent from Greek, Latin, Art History, and Anthropology, all of which subjects are the prov-

ince of different and autonomous departments. But by and large my colleagues and former students teaching in other American institutions are not so fortunate, and must deal with ancient art "on the run," as it were, for very brief periods as part of much larger surveys or, if for entire semesters, in much more general terms than those I have been able to detail under the various categories of "major arts." It is understandable that, for such curricula, American institutions prefer to hire trained art historians who can also "do" ancient art. The result is that the average instructor has neither the training nor the time to delve into archaeology and keep abreast of current trends and recent discoveries. The same traditional and superficial notions of out-of-date handbooks too often are passed down to the students whenever classical art is used solely as a prerequisite for understanding Renaissance or Neoclassical monuments. Yet innovative thinking and new basic directions are likely to be formulated first within archaeological circles, as these produce new evidence from the past that requires constant updating. The dilemma is real and should be faced.

To be sure, not even at an institution offering a major in the discipline can Archaeology 101 afford to deal with ancient art at a sophisticated level. Freshmen must be given a structured framework of basic monuments and "facts" that they can retain and on which they eventually build refinements and corrections, as they move through the advanced courses for an archaeology major. Yet we are all quite careful not to oversimplify or teach what we now know to be questionable attributions or challengeable dates. I can no longer state with a clear conscience that the Hermes of Olympia is by the fourth-century Praxiteles, nor can I show the students the "Roman copies" of the Athena Lemnia by Pheidias, or speak of the Laokoon as a typical example of Hellenistic sculpture.¹²⁵ As long as an element of doubt exists, I shall rather exemplify Praxiteles' work with the replicas of the Knidia, "Pheidian" style with the architectural originals from the Parthenon, and Hellenistic art with the Pergamon Gigantomachy. The other, and perhaps more or equally famous monuments are mentioned with a caveat, a word of caution to be remembered and refined later. But "pure" art historians may not even be aware that a problem exists, or that new evidence has been found — and for this fault we often have to blame the

¹²² *Utopia del Passato*, Bari, 1981.

¹²³ M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, Cambridge, 1975, and *A Shorter History of Greek Art*, Cambridge, 1981. R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Rome, The Center of Power*, New York, 1970, and *Rome, The Late Empire*, New York, 1971.

¹²⁴ For the "identity-crisis" current in archaeology see, e.g., H.A. Thompson, "In Pursuit of the Past: The American Role 1879-1979," *AJA*, LXXXIV, 1980, 263-270, and, in the same volume, J. Wiseman, "Archaeology in the Future: An Evolving Discipline," 279-285; J. Pouilloux, "Archaeology Today," 311-12, and C. Renfrew, "The Great Tradition Versus the Great Divide: Archaeology as Anthropology?" 287-298. For a more recent dis-

ussion, see A.M. Snodgrass, "The New Archaeology and the Classical Archaeologist," *AJA*, LXXXIX, 1985, 31-37.

For a possible crisis in art history see the papers collected in *Art Journal*, Winter, 1982.

¹²⁵ Hermes of Olympia: that the statue we have should be dated no earlier than the 2nd century B.C. is shown by the study of its sandals; see Morrow, *Greek Footwear* (as in n. 9), and my comments in *Roman Copies* (as in n. 22), 42-43, 85-86.

Athena Lemnia: K. Hartswick, "The Athena Lemnia Reconsidered," *AJA*, LXXXVII, 1983, 335-346.

Laokoon: see Simon (as in n. 26).

slowness or the peculiar diffusion of publications.¹²⁶

Himmelman quotes Goethe: disciplines self-destruct in two ways — through the extension in which they move and the depth to which they plunge.¹²⁷ This statement certainly applies to the study of ancient art. Archaeologists are increasingly aware of how much there is to know — and how difficult it is to encompass it all — since the borders of the Old World are constantly expanding as we learn about peripheral and earlier cultures. On the other hand, they have almost put their discipline out of reach, by breaking it into a variety of specializations, each one with a distinctive vocabulary and a vast bibliography of its own. I have already alluded to this problem in dealing with pottery and vase painting, but the stricture applies equally to numismatics, the study of lamps, or of amphora stamps, to name a few, each of which has great potential contributions to make to our general knowledge, were we only able to keep abreast of new developments. I can only warn art historians and archaeologists alike: the first are in danger of being too superficial and uninformed; the second, too specialized and self-contained.

Even in the best of all worlds — among archaeologists who pursue their own studies within their discipline, with few digressions into other fields — some problems are apparent. New directions have been taken in our approach to Roman copies and our attributions of Greek originals, yet not all are ready to follow the new leads or to abandon cherished notions. In some cases, they are not even willing to reexamine their premises, since their convictions would then be seen to rest on emotionalism and tradition (the *ipse dixit* of a beloved teacher, or the authority of a written source) rather than on proper evidence. Some studies have already been mentioned as basically sterile and fossilized into a single approach — for instance, the field of Roman portraiture, which still follows German guidelines established almost a century ago — yet the prestige of the pioneers is still strong enough that fresh thinking seems impossible or, even worse, “unorthodox” and therefore inherently wrong. Magna Graecia and Etruria are indeed being seen under a different light and with greater appreciation, but our eyes are still trained on Athenian standards and we automatically, even unconsciously, judge everything else by them. It is true that Athens, with its wealth of inscriptions, history, and culture, has left so far the most indelible imprint on the Greek past; but it is also true that

enough other evidence now exists for us to shed our Athenocentrism, should we want to try.

One more criticism, again entirely subjective in nature, is leveled at the many students of ancient art who shun sculpture because “everything has already been said about it” or because “it is too difficult.” Although I am more sympathetic toward the second complaint, I cannot condone it because stylistic analysis can be learned and visual perception refined. As for the first objection, it is not worth considering, since not only are new finds providing major fresh material, but — most important — new questions are now being asked of the evidence, which can elicit revolutionary answers.

New material for study may occasionally be troublesome, since the love of antiquity and the collecting mania have created such a profitable market that both forgeries and objects obtained through thievery and illicit digging are entering our art galleries and museums.¹²⁸ An object out of its context can only be appreciated on aesthetic grounds, for its visual appearance, like someone beautiful whom we admire from a distance, without ever speaking to or getting to know. After a while, the exercise seems futile and pleasure pales by comparison with intelligent and lively conversation with a less physically attractive but more articulate companion. Any artifact acquires beauty and importance as a representative of the culture that produced it. An illicitly excavated object is often given a false provenience to cover the robbers’ tracks; far from adding to our knowledge of the past, therefore, it can often confuse our notions and thus be dangerous.¹²⁹ On the other side of the issue remains the moral dilemma of what to do with such objects, once the illicit digging (with its consequent obliteration of context) has taken place and the monument exists on open display. Should our research and publications ignore it, in tacit agreement with the law against illicit imports, or should they take it into account as one more item of evidence, albeit limited and potentially flawed? As an editor, I have often had to face this dilemma and know that there are no easy answers, although I know what my own answer should be, on ethical grounds.

Finally, and again speaking from my editorial experience of the past eight years, I bemoan current standards of literacy and research. All too often are original thinking and careful study marred by obscure writing and overcomplex phrasing. Occasionally, even grammar and syntax leave

¹²⁶ In recent years there has been a proliferation of periodicals in a variety of languages, especially in Italy, where virtually every major university has its own journal. In many cases, moreover, important finds do not receive official publication for decades (the Peiraeus Apollo is still waiting, from 1959), and they are only known in restricted circles, through word of mouth. Personal contacts and constant scrutiny of such publications as the *JHS Archaeological Reports*, or other newsletters, become therefore essential to keep abreast of the latest theories.

¹²⁷ Himmelman, *Utopische Vergangenheit*, 15: “Die Wissenschaften zerstören sich auf doppelte Weise selbst: durch die Breite, in die sie gehen, und durch die Tiefe, in die sie sich versenken.”

¹²⁸ For the ethical question see, e.g., *The Preservation and Use of Artistic*

Cultural Heritage: Perspectives and Solutions (A Symposium held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, May 27-29, 1980), esp. the paper by M. Pallottino, pp. 71-77. For the official position of the Archaeological Institute of America, and of the *AJA*, see *AJA*, LXXXII, 1978, 1, No. 3, and *AJA*, LXXXVI, 1982, 1-2.

Note also G.R. Cooke, “Should Curators Collect? Some Considerations for a Code of Ethics,” *Curator*, xxv 1982, 161-170.

¹²⁹ For the dangers of this situation, see, e.g., E.O. Negahban, *AJA*, LXXXVIII, 1984, 3-10; or the deplorable dismemberment of bronze statues from Turkey: J. Inan and C.P. Jones, “Der Bronzeturso im Burdur-Museum aus Bubon und der Bronzekopf im J.-Paul-Getty-Museum,” *IstMitt*, xxvii-viii, 1977-78, 267-296. See also J. Wiseman, “Scholarship and Provenience in the Study of Artifacts,” *JFA*, xi, 1984, 67-77.

something to be desired! It is regrettable that so few today try to write logically and concisely, or know how. To be sure, some art-historical writings, by their very nature, may lend themselves to elaborate phraseology and complex aesthetic appreciations that all too often seem to mean little or nothing. But if the purpose of publishing is to communicate our ideas to others, such communication would be greatly improved by clarity and concision. I confess to wondering, occasionally, whether an obscure writing style is meant to mask vague and incomplete thinking — and this last stricture is not limited to American writers, but can be extended to French, German and Italian authors, in alphabetical order.

In the United States, the pressure of the job market has affected art historians and archaeologists alike, and too many articles and books are being written simply to obtain a position or secure tenure — in other words, to heed the warning to “publish or perish.” Perhaps as a corollary, the scholarly apparatus of such writings is often inadequate; even strong and sound contributions are at times marred by imperfect or incomplete references, jotted down carelessly and hastily and never double-checked. Liberties taken with foreign titles and names, not to mention opinions and quotations, are occasionally appalling, and an alert editor may have a heavy task, if conscientiously carried out.

Yet this negative criticism should not seem to outweigh the positive outlook of my first section. Albeit imperfect, like any human activity, the study of ancient art is thriving, both here and abroad, and its humanistic influence yearly reaches thousand of students, not a few of whom will probably follow their leaders into exciting new directions.

A major contributor to the programs of the Archaeological Institute of America, Brunilde Ridgway has been no less active as a scholar. Among her scores of books, articles, and reviews are The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture (1970), The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture (1977), Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture (1981), and Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture. The Problem of the Originals (1984). [Department of Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA 19010]

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations of journal titles conform to the most recent usage of the *American Journal of Archaeology*.

- AA: Archäologischer Anzeiger
 AAA: Athens Annals of Archaeology
 AJA: American Journal of Archaeology
 ANRW: H. Temporini, Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin, 1972-)
 AntCL: L'Antiquité classique
 AntJ: Antiquaries' Journal
 AntK: Antike Kunst
 AntP: Antike Plastik
 ArchCl: Archeologia Classica
 ArchNews: Archaeological News
 ArtB: Art Bulletin
 ASAtene: Annuario della R. Scuola Archeologica di Atene
 AthMitt: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung
 AttiMGrecia: Atti e memorie della Società Magna Grecia
 BdA: Bollettino d'arte
 BICS: Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London
 BonnJbb: Bonner Jahrbücher
 BSR: British School of Archaeology at Rome, Papers
 DialAr: Dialoghi di archeologia
 FA: Fasti Archaeologici
 IstMitt: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Istanbul
 JdI: Jahrbuch des k. Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
 JFA: Journal of Field Archaeology
 JHS: Journal of Hellenic Studies
 JRS: Journal of Roman Studies
 LIMC: Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (Zurich and Munich, 1974)
 MAAR: Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome
 RA: Revue archéologique
 REA: Revue des études anciennes
 RendLinc: Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei
 RömMitt: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung
 StEtr: Studi etruschi
 ZPE: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik