

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

1987

Review of *Kopien und Nachahmungen im Hellenismus: Ein Beitrag zum Klassizismus des 2. und frühen 1. Jhs. v. Chr.*, by Jörg-Peter Niemeier

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: http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs

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

Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1987. Review of *Kopien und Nachahmungen im Hellenismus: Ein Beitrag zum Klassizismus des 2. und frühen 1. Jhs. v. Chr.*, by Jörg-Peter Niemeier. *American Journal of Archaeology* 91:624-626.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/26

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

All of this is devoted to a survey of almost 1000 years in the life of Egypt. Writing about a millennium without either ignoring development or becoming mired at great length in detail is a hard job. Only Chapter 2 is really narrative in any sense, and it moves rapidly. In Chapters 3 and 6, Bowman takes care to bring out the important changes in the government's methods of ruling and in religion over these years; elsewhere he avoids banality and makes distinctions by variety in his choice of texts and illustrations. The chapter on the economy perhaps has less sense of chronological development than the others, but that may be realistic. The style is in general smooth and painless, and with a generous mix of illustrations, the pages flow quickly by. One complaint: the specific illustrations in this book are never (so far as I noticed) referred to in the text, so that pictures (with their captions) and text run parallel but are not closely tied together. Rostovtzeff said (in the introduction to his *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*) that his "illustrations are not intended to amuse the reader and to console him for the dryness of the text and notes. They form an important constituent part of my work." The illustrations here too are an important constituent part (even if often a diverting one), and it is a pity that the author did not go a bit further in integrating them.

Covering so much ground does make it difficult to impose any unifying theme on the book. In the Epilogue, Bowman argues that "no stark and rigid division between 'Greek' and 'Egyptian' can be useful in describing the development of this society after Alexander the Great." He concludes with the hope that he has made a case for believing that Greek and Roman elements in Egypt "both contributed to and benefited from the development of Egyptian civilization." This theme in fact comes out at various points in the book. For example, Bowman argues that the Ptolemies and Romans produced in Egypt an economy with a higher level of sophistication than is found elsewhere in the ancient Mediterranean (Ch. 3) and at the same time considerably more developed than that of Egypt before the coming of the Greeks (Ch. 4). A similar point of view turns up in the discussion of public administration, and the reciprocal influences of Greek and Egyptian culture are brought out. The point of view is rather more positive about the effects of foreign rule than what one often encounters, though it is hardly the naive enthusiasm of past generations in the heyday of European colonialism. It deserves careful discussion.

It is worth singling out the chapter on religion for attention. The Greeks and Romans mostly thought Egyptian cults exotic (though some of the Greeks in Egypt certainly embraced them), and modern scholars in general have not done well at understanding the internal realities of a pagan's religion. Bowman's account is deliberately written from the point of view of the Greeks, not the Egyptians, but it is sympathetic and realistic; the reader gets a good sense of what it was that the Greeks encountered.

The readers of this journal will want to know how well the aim to use archaeological material along with the written has been fulfilled. As indicated above, the illustrations contribute greatly to the book even with less than total integration. Archaeology plays a substantial role in some discus-

sions, such as that of the crops grown in Egypt, or that of the character of towns and villages, not to speak of Alexandria. Elsewhere it is illustrative more than integral. I do not underestimate the difficulty of the enterprise; it may be impossible without more preliminary studies. What we have here is much more than we generally find.

No book with the range of this one can be free from faults of various sorts. But this one has comparatively few, and its merits are great. It deserves a wide readership.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

DEPARTMENTS OF CLASSICS AND HISTORY
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10027

KOPIEN UND NACHAHMUNGEN IM HELLENISMUS. EIN BEITRAG ZUM KLASSIZISMUS DES 2. UND FRÜHEN 1. JHS. V. CHR., by Jörg-Peter Niemeier. (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke, Reihe Klassische Archäologie 20.) Pp. 246, figs. 38. Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, Bonn 1985.

In recent years, a great deal of interest has focused on the issue of copies, of all periods and forms; note for instance the 1985 Symposium at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C., on "Retaining the Original," of forthcoming publication in the History of Art Series. In terms of ancient art, this interest is leading to ever greater differentiation between Roman creations imitating Classical styles and works reproducing Classical prototypes with varying degrees of faithfulness to the original, primary among such studies being P. Zanker's *Klassizistische Statuen* (1974). The work here under review, originally a dissertation presented to Bonn University in 1983/84, has the specific purpose of testing a theory advocated since the time of Furtwängler: that Hellenistic copies, obtained without mechanical means, represent approximations rather than true replicas of a given prototype; as such, they are merely the forerunners of exact copies, which start only in the Roman period, and no earlier than the first century B.C. A definite progression would therefore be traceable, from the less to the more exact reproduction, according to the time when the sculpture was made. The copying phenomenon itself is seen as a by-product of Classicizing tendencies, the onset of which is placed within the second century B.C.

Niemeier does not attempt a complete listing of all Hellenistic works that could be considered copies of a Classical prototype; he selects (primarily from Pergamon, but also from Delos and other eastern—that is, east of Italy—sources) 21 sculptures traditionally dated within the second and the first century B.C. He then examines them stylistically, typologically, and structurally; he determines their approximate date on whatever evidence may be available (mostly through comparisons with other more or less datable works and largely on stylistic grounds); he finally analyzes them in terms of their relationship to the alleged prototypes. The 21 examples are thus seen to belong to three different categories. True copies are the Meleager head and the Athe-

na Giustiniani head from the Athenian Agora, the Kaufmann head from Tralles, the two Smaller Herculaneis figures from Delos, the Leaning Aphrodite from Philadelphia or Tralles, the Steinhäuser head in Basel, the Delos Diadoumenos and the Alexander Erbach from the Athenian Akropolis. Adaptations (*Umbildungen*) are: from Pergamon, the Athena Parthenos, the so-called Hera, the Peplophoros no. 26, the Leda, the Athena with diagonal aegis; from Delos, the Athena Medici; and from Samos the so-called Hera. The remaining works are considered new conceptions or creations (*Nachschöpfungen, Neukonzeptionen*): from Pergamon, the Athena with crossed aegis, the draped figure no. 77, and a statue of Zeus Ammon; from elsewhere, the Este Aphrodite in Vienna, the Aphrodite from Melos, and the Eretria Youth. Two appendices deal with the sculptures from the House of the Five Statues in Delos and the Kalydon busts, because these groups seem to draw from heterogeneous prototypes. A previous appendix had discussed the Running Peplophoros from Pergamon, which various authors have considered either Severe or Classicizing, without reaching a definite dating and classification.

On the basis of these works, Niemeier concludes that it is impossible to accept the theory of a gradual development toward increasingly precise copying; from the very beginning of the trend, all forms of duplication are possible, from the general adaptation to the exact replica and the new creation in Classical style. He considers the Athena Giustiniani head from Athens a reduced but exact copy of the original, therefore setting the beginning of exact copying around the middle of the second century B.C. The Meleager head from the Agora, here dated contemporary with the Athena, is the first known copy at the same scale, the Kaufmann head with related torso the first assured copy of a whole statue, the Alexander Erbach (first century B.C.) the first known replica of a portrait. Many of the "copies" come from Pergamon; on the basis of the findspots, Niemeier believes that the Athena Giustiniani and the Meleager head come from the Stoa of Attalos, that is, from a Pergamon-related building. He therefore sees the trend toward duplicating works of art as connected with the Attalids and their cultural policies—a theory strengthened by the presence of so many academicians at their court. Once the trend started, it never stopped and found increased momentum in the Roman Imperial period.

Niemeier's basic thesis can be accepted, but a few clarifications and objections can be added. The underlying assumption, stated in the first sentence of the Introduction, that *Klassizismus* (defined as the adherence to the formal principles of Classical prototypes, n. 1) begins around 180–160 B.C., can be disputed. A rebuttal by S. Steinbrückner is already in press, according to D. Willers (*AntK* 29 [1986] 146 n. 41); and I would personally believe that Classicizing forms are present as early as the early third century B.C. Niemeier avoids all Classical instances of duplication and series, because he concentrates on Hellenistic works; all earlier attempts would be simple imitations of types and motifs, not conscious reproductions of a specific prototype. Yet this may not be the case with some of the statuettes from the Kyparissi (Kos) sanctuary, at least three of which are dated to the third century and repeat well-established models.

Moreover, all works selected by Niemeier as true and exact copies are only known through other Roman replicas: the original is lost and therefore the degree of accuracy of any reproduction must remain somewhat uncertain.

Even more problematic is Niemeier's dating of some of his examples. I cannot, for instance, see any true resemblance between the head of the Zeus Ammon from Pergamon and the style of the Pergamon Gigantomachy; I would thus question a contemporary date for the freestanding statue, and whatever inference could be derived from it. The two heads in Athens are also dated on stylistic grounds. The Athena is stated to be more developed than the heads on the Telephos frieze and so is the Meleager head; thus both are placed within the same time span as the Stoa of Attalos, in whose general proximity they were found. The conclusion is therefore drawn that both statues originally belonged to the embellishment of the Pergamene portico, and they become evidence for Attalid sponsorship of copying. Yet the Meleager came from a Late Antique context, and that of the Athena is uncertain. Moreover, the duplication of famous Classical prototypes at Pergamon might make sense, but why would Attalos II promote the creation of such copies for Athens, where many Classical originals still stood in his days? It is also well to remember that no less a connoisseur of Greek art than Schuchhardt strongly advocated a mid-second century date for the Iliion metopes (traditionally dated to the third) on the basis of a comparison between the Helios and heads on the Telephos frieze (*AntP* 17 [1978] 92–93).

The Athena from the Pergamon Library, generally accepted as an adaptation of the Parthenos in Athens, is interpreted as a conscious alteration by the Hellenistic sculptor, to convey a message more appropriate for his time and locale. This suggestion is certainly correct, but it is also appropriate to ask whether a mechanical copy of the total chryselephantine figure would ever have been possible, not only in terms of accessibility, but primarily on technical grounds, given the materials involved and the colossal scale. Niemeier considers the Varvakeion statuette the most faithful copy after the original, in antiquarian details. Here too, however, one could ask to what extent this Antonine version reflects the Pheidias original, if the entire temple (and thus presumably also the statue) had already been damaged in the second century A.C.

Some random comments: Niemeier dates the Samian "Hera" within the second century, but he accepts a late fourth/early third-century date for the Thasian choragic monument, without discussing Salviat's higher chronology (on prosopographical grounds: *BCH* Suppl. 5 [1979] 155–67). The Meleager and other busts from Kalydon are treated as a homogeneous group, without proper stress on the fact that several of them may be heads reused from full statues, some recut from previous sculptures. The Muse with Nebris from the Delian House could find a prototype, were we able to see with greater clarity some of the pedimental figures from the fourth-century Temple of Apollo at Delphi, which I suspect may have provided inspiration for several Hellenistic adaptations. I have difficulty accepting the Steinhäuser head as a replica of the Belvedere Apollo, and the Classical date of the latter has recently been

disputed by Pfrommer and Morrow, on the basis of sandal forms.

In summary, Niemeier's book is helpful but somewhat vitiated by some preconceived notions about Classicism, traditional dates, respect for the *communis opinio*, and a vague adherence to Kraemer's stylistic formulas, despite their outdated value in the light of current knowledge. What is most rewarding is the author's willingness to reconsider some established dogmas and his open-minded approach to the history of ancient copying. If his methodology can be challenged in specific cases, his general conclusions seem sound, and should be kept in mind by future researchers of this important aspect of Classical sculpture.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

HELLENISTIC PAINTING TECHNIQUES: THE EVIDENCE OF THE DELOS FRAGMENTS, by *Vincent J. Bruno*. (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 11.) Pp. viii + 66, figs. 2, color pls. 16. E. J. Brill, Leiden 1985.

Bruno's consideration of various fragmentary figured friezes from painted mural decoration in the so-called Masonry Style on the island of Delos is modest in scope, but it is nevertheless a valuable contribution to renewed scholarly interest over the last 10 years in Hellenistic and Roman wall painting (recent studies, e.g., by A. Barbet, *MEFRA* 93 [1981] 917-98; I. Bragantini, M. de Vos, and F. Badoni, *Pittura e pavimenti di Pompei* [Rome 1981]; and A. Laidlaw, *The First Style in Pompeii: Painting and Architecture* [Rome 1985]). In order to obtain permission to illustrate the unpublished fragments in his volume, Bruno had to omit any discussion of iconography and especially of archaeological contexts, both of which are to be the focus of the forthcoming comprehensive catalogue of the Delos material from the French School at Athens. A short section offers a historical overview of the destructive raids in the first century B.C. which helps explain the sad state of preservation of the friezes, but stylistic chronology itself plays no role in Bruno's work. Bruno uses details of the fragments represented in his plates rather for a discussion of painting techniques. Although the restrictions placed on the material by the French must have proved extremely frustrating for the author, Bruno has nevertheless managed to yield a great deal from it. The text is well written and rich in stimulating interpretation. The inclusion of some maps (of the Aegean world, of the island of Delos, and of the site) would have made it stronger still. The color plates (both watercolor sketches by the author and photographs of figure-friezes from the site, constituting 14 of the 16 plates) set new standards for clarity and overall presentation.

Chapters I and II analyze the painting technique of two particular fragments: the Garland Frieze (classed with conventional decoration, yet involving unusual patterns and narrative possibilities) and the Frieze of the Actors (less con-

ventional, more accomplished, but maintaining "the fiction" of two-dimensional backgrounds). The next two chapters concentrate on two methods characteristic of the technique of the Masonry Style: the black-background frieze (Ch. III) and the monochrome in white (Ch. IV). Backgrounds are seen as highly charged fields of color behind figures which appear somewhat three-dimensional thanks to the contrast between the two. Bruno shows that color schemes and the way figures are rendered represent sophisticated responses to various problems of design in this wall decoration. Many other kinds of evidence (stone, mosaic, vase painting) to which the Delos fragments may be compared are thoroughly presented. An important omission among parallels for monochrome in white, however, is the influence of stucco relief (cf. R. Ling, "Stucco Decoration in Pre-Augustan Italy," *BSR* 40 [1972] 11-57). Chapter V succinctly highlights many of the observations of the earlier chapters, with particular emphasis on the artistic vocabulary ("pictorial ideas") behind the painting technique in the Delos fragments. Bruno concludes that the ambiguities and distortions of color and space in these late Hellenistic friezes make a "direct appeal to the universal emotions of the subconscious."

Bruno's enthusiasm for his topic is everywhere evident (the technique of the Delos paintings is convincingly seen as "a part of an art historical process" that has repeated itself in works of such artists as Turner, Moore, de Chirico, and Goya). Because Bruno's theories are so meticulously reasoned, the result is a sensitive aesthetic analysis from which all students of ancient painting will greatly benefit.

ANN OLGA KOLOSKI-OSTROW

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND ORIENTAL STUDIES
RABB 141
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02254

ITALIAN IRON AGE ARTEFACTS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM, edited by *Judith Swaddling*. (Papers of the Sixth British Museum Classical Colloquium.) Pp. 438, ills. British Museum Publications, Ltd., London 1986. £75

There has been only one attempt to publish an illustrated guide to the antiquities of the Italian peninsula since the great work of Oscar Montelius, *La civilisation primitive en Italie depuis les métaux* (Stockholm 1895-1910), that of T. Hackens and P. Marchetti, *Antiquités italiennes étrusques et romaines* (Louvain 1977), intended for use in university courses and providing ample illustration but no text. There is something which discourages such enterprises. The natural geographical and cultural divisions of the Italian peninsula certainly make a single view of Italian material culture impossible. The intensity of foreign influences at the end of the Bronze Age and during the Iron Age (from Urnfield Europe as well as from the East) contribute their share to the same discontinuity. The resulting pattern of material culture is marked by tawdry imitations of foreign wares and short-lived offshoots of foreign industries that die out without heirs. The history of Etruscan vase-painting as recon-