

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

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Faculty
Research and Scholarship

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology

1999

Review of *Les sculptures grecques II: La période hellénistique (IIIe-Ier siècles avant J.-C.)*, by Marianne Hamiaux

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. 1999. Review of *Les sculptures grecques II: La période hellénistique (IIIe-Ier siècles avant J.-C.)*, by Marianne Hamiaux. *American Journal of Archaeology* 103:158-159.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/40

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

exceptions—can those attitudes that scholars have argued signified sorrow or grief be isolated to the funerary context or necessarily be understood as emotional. The numerous depictions of warriors are shown to be rather general references to military service and not to death in war, while the reliefs showing childbirth probably did refer to death in childbirth, but their insignificant number, small scale, and poor artistic quality invalidate any comparison with the reliefs depicting warlike actions. Cause of death, individual deaths, and sorrow were simply not regarded as important issues.

Chapters 3–5 then turn to those aspects that the grave reliefs clearly did wish to communicate. The author begins by focusing on the general lack in the reliefs of a coherent story or meaningful interaction between the persons depicted. In the case of men, their appearance, attitudes, and attributes do not constitute one meaningful situation or specific event, but relate to various activities of civic life-style, such as athletics, hunting, military training, rhetoric, and sacrifices, while the attributes of women (which include babies) are associated with women's responsibilities, such as the care of children and the household. Furthermore, personal relations between an older and a younger generation are shown to be far more frequently depicted than relations between married couples, which is taken to indicate an emphasis on family genealogy. Studies in head types point in the same direction. These reveal a clear neglect in means of individualization, but an increasing interest in the depiction of stereotyped age categories at the same time as multiple-figured scenes increase. Family members are thus categorized as "child," "young," "mature," or "old." In scenes with young and old people, grave inscriptions indicate that it is often the old family members who are dead, not the young ones. What is therefore being communicated is not private sorrow due to "untimely death," but rather the young generation's fulfillment of its obligation toward the polis to take care of the older generation and pay for their funerals.

A quantitative approach to themes and picture compositions surveys other polis-oriented activities, revealing their repetitiveness and hereby demonstrating again the lack of personal themes. Male activities are always linked to the public sphere, female ones to the private domain, while grave reliefs for children are on the whole very rare, adding further support to the criticism of the "untimely death" theory. It is accordingly argued that the reliefs cannot be taken as evidence for an increased interest in private or personal matters causing a decline in polis values, as several scholars have maintained. On the contrary, the fourth-century grave reliefs displayed for the public the ideal polis family comprising several generations, whose individual members behaved according to civic norms and values, and whose younger members took care of older members.

The last chapter deals with the relationship between grave reliefs and social stratigraphy. On the basis of the reliefs with preserved information regarding social status, it is shown how the choice of grave reliefs varied comparatively little between citizens, metics, and slaves, since the two last-mentioned social groups generally sought to imitate the taste of full citizens in the funerary context. Therefore, in spite of some demonstrable and vast differences in funerary luxury among social classes mocking the principles of democracy, the size, theme, and quality of a grave

relief cannot be taken as an unambiguous guide to social class, as has also been argued in scholarly researches.

The general conclusions reached by Bergemann regarding the polis-mindedness of Athenian private grave reliefs will hardly come as a big surprise in scholarly circles. The interdependency between oikos and polis behavior has been intensely discussed in the last decade, not least in recent studies of gender aspects of Classical Athenian grave reliefs and burial rituals (grave gifts, distribution of burials). Also, Bergemann's brief statement in his summary that the Attic grave reliefs suddenly became obsolete almost overnight at the end of the fourth century, which caused the production to cease, is contradicted by recent research in fourth-century grave gift patterns. This suggests that new norms and values were already making incursions around 400, which made the ones communicated on Attic grave reliefs look somewhat old-fashioned. In fact, Bergemann's own research points in the same direction, since he to a large extent has used fifth-century vase painting as parallels for the iconography of the reliefs. These circumstances, however, in no way lessen the immense value of this book, which lies in its convincing and thorough revision of the many out-of-date theories surrounding Attic grave reliefs. This is accomplished through analyses of the whole production of this category and their grave enclosures, and it will greatly help future studies in ancient perceptions of death to be less colored by our own modern attitudes to these themes.

SANNE HOUBY-NIELSEN

NY CARLSBERG GLYPTOTEK
DANTES PLADS 7
DK 1556 COPENHAGEN V
DENMARK
NCG@PIP.DKNET.DK

LES SCULPTURES GRECQUES II: LA PÉRIODE HELLÉNISTIQUE (III^e–I^{er} SIÈCLES AVANT J.-C.), by *Marianne Hamiaux*. (Musée du Louvre, Département des antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines.) Pp. 336, figs. 510. Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, Paris 1998. 450 FF. ISBN 2-7118-3603-7.

Except for a visitor's guide, by J. Charbonneau (1963), the Louvre had not had a catalogue of its Greek and Roman sculptures since 1922, when E. Michon published a second edition of A. Héron de Villefosse's *Catalogue sommaire* of 1896. Yet this delay has been beneficial. In recent years, the Louvre has undergone a thorough revision of its classical installations, including the judicious removal of some arbitrary restorations, a proper cleaning of the objects, and a display based on modern principles of museology—pedestals that do not detract from the ancient items, location at eye level to the visitor, and accessibility from all sides rather than placement determined by the architectural articulation of the ornate rooms (see A. Pasquier, *RA* 1994, 253–63). As the exhibition separates Greek originals from works of Roman date, so the new publications maintain this division of the material. A first volume, also by M. Hamiaux, cataloguing 304 items from the

“origins” to the end of the fourth century B.C., appeared in 1992. This second volume deals with the following phase.

An excellent introduction by the author explains the criteria adopted in the presentation. The enormous difficulties involved in dating Hellenistic sculpture are well known, but it is gratifying to find acknowledgment that Kramer’s famous phases are no longer considered reliable, and that various styles, both new and old, coexisted during the three centuries in question. Only three of the 397 items covered by the catalogue carry a firm date, and these are not particularly illuminating in stylistic terms: a stele from Kyzikos mentioning a battle fought by Julius Caesar in 46 B.C. (no. 204), a sundial dedicated to Ptolemy II (probably between 277 and 262 B.C. on historical grounds, no. 218), and a cylindrical altar with boukrania and garlands inscribed by the people of Thera to Ptolemy VI (reigned 180–145 B.C., no. 220). The material has therefore been grouped typologically: statues (only six, but with related fragments and objects from the same contexts numbered separately), heads from statues, dynastic portraits (by ruler’s date, even if not contemporary), statuettes and small heads, and 63 funerary (including three Boiotian limestone examples) and 25 votive or undetermined reliefs, some of which may be Early Imperial.

Three groupings are less obvious, but based on the official definition of sculpture as any type of worked stone. The category of “Tomb Decoration” includes the painted metopes from the “Tomba dell’Altalena” at Cyrene (a structure fully published in 1976), marble doors, and furniture from Macedonian tombs. “Architectural elements” (the most numerous) comprise items from Vergina, Samothrace, Didyma, and Magnesia, some identified for the first time. A category of “Objects” is the most disparate: the famous base from Messene with lion hunt; three relief vases (the Sosibios Vase, the well-known Borghese krater, and a dinos with riders found at Pergamon), two sundials, 12 votive and funerary cylindrical altars, three cinerary urns from Sardis (precisely dated by their inscriptions but plain), and six remarkable limestone helmets from Egypt, usually considered models, but here described as finials for votive *cippi*. I cannot help recalling the stone turbans topping comparable shafts in Islamic cemeteries.

In order to avoid publication delays, every effort was made to keep the commentary to essentials—and it must have been difficult, because some items are among the most famous in the Louvre: the Nike of Samothrace, the “Venus de Milo,” and the Borghese Warrior. For the first time, all fragments associated with the Victory are published and illustrated together—from the body (right hand, tip of a finger or toe), the wings, the drapery, and the ship base. Even the block signed by a Rhodian (Pythokritos?) is included, although defined as the base for a statuette. Similarly, the three herms found with the Melian Aphrodite are catalogued together with the arm fragments (whether pertinent or not), but the plinth signed by a sculptor from Antioch is hopelessly lost. The Borghese Warrior exemplifies the difficulty of determining regional classifications—signed by an Ephesian master, made in Pentelic marble, and found in Italy (Nero’s villa). It retains its 17th-century right arm, but all entries scrupulously list repairs and restorations, so that for the first time readers can clearly distinguish between ancient and modern details. The bibliography is updated to 1996 (one local publica-

tion dates from 1997)—selective for famous pieces, extensive for the lesser known. Five items were previously unpublished. All entries carry at least one illustration, many of them new photographs.

An important contribution of the catalogue is its sequential numbering of items, which allows for quick and simple reference, bypassing the complex inventory systems explained (20–21) and cross-referenced in an appendix. Errors have been corrected in the process, and provenience has been determined with greater precision, through careful review of the collection’s history. Most of the important items derive from 19th-century French expeditions to northern Greece, Asia Minor, and the Aegean islands, but acquisitions and gifts continue to enrich the museum—among the significant purchases, the Kaufmann head (no. 63, bought in 1951); among the latest, a head of Ptolemy II (no. 75, bought in 1989). Because of the importance of the stelai, concordance with E. Pfuhl and H. Möbius, *Die Ostgriechischen Grabreliefs* (Mainz 1977–1979) is provided, as well as with *IG and Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* (Bonn 1972). A volume on the Greek inscriptions in the Louvre is in preparation. The finial of the Samothracian Arsinoeion rates a catalogue entry (no. 289), but was given to the island in exchange for the Nike’s hand.

Only a few comments are possible in a review of this nature. The costume of the Victory could have been described in greater detail (I believe the chiton may have been belted twice, the mantle had a long overfold). V. Gabrielsen (*The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes* [Aarhus 1997] 88–89) cannot accept the ship base as a trihemelia. The dynastic portraits (including the famous “Inopos” from Delos and the Alexander Guimet) range from very convincing to a few outright *dubitanda*, not simply in terms of identification (often properly challenged), but also of authenticity. It is regrettable, although understandable, that the Didymaion bases have not been included among the catalogued items (because of their Imperial date), and that description of the Magnesia frieze slabs has been omitted (except for the newly recognized fragment), because of Davesne’s 1982 publication, but it is helpful to see the Artemision waterspouts in a sequence, which highlights the difference in the rendering of the lions.

Curator Alain Pasquier and the author are to be warmly congratulated for this painstaking and enormously useful publication.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

THE ARTISTS OF THE ARA PACIS: THE PROCESS OF HELLENIZATION IN ROMAN RELIEF SCULPTURE, by *Diane Atnally Conlin*. Pp. xviii + 145, figs. 247. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill 1997. \$65. ISBN 0-8078-2343-0.

Unlike his forum and other structures for which Augustus took personal credit for financing and constructing,